THE
MODERN CHURCHMAN

By identifying the new learning with heresy, you make orthodoxy synonymous with ignorance.—*Erasmus*

A State without the means of change is without the means of its conservation.—*Edmund Burke.*

No. 4 DECEMBER Vol. XLIII

SIGNS OF THE TIMES

Excommunication of Innocent Divorcees

The following extract from the *Daily Mail* of October 26th, 1953, demands the serious attention of all who desire, in the interest of Christian influence in this land, to maintain the comprehensiveness of the Church of England and the legal rights of its laity.

Commander Walter Raleigh Gilbert, squire of the Devon village of Marldon, to-day by-passed the parish church where for centuries his ancestors worshipped and drove six miles to attend service in Paignton.

For the Rev. S. L. Landon, 62-year-old vicar of Marldon, discovering that the squire's first marriage was dissolved, has banned him from taking Communion there.

Mr. Landon said to-day: 'It matters not that Commander Gilbert was the "innocent party" in the divorce. Christ's teaching on that particular subject is detailed in the tenth chapter of St. Mark, and no priest can ignore it.

'I have nothing against Commander Gilbert as a man, but if he should approach my altar I should refuse him Communion, and he has been told so.

'Not everyone reads that chapter as I do. I consider it should be taken at its face value.

'It matters not to me what was permitted before I came here or what other incumbents may do now. I must be guided by my own conscience.'

Commander Gilbert attended Marldon Church for two years after his first marriage was dissolved. The five children of his second marriage were all christened there.

In his home, the fifteenth-century Compton Castle, now the property of the National Trust, Commander Gilbert, 64-year-old descendant of the great Elizabethan sea-dogs whose names he bears, said: 'I think it is a most un-Christian act to refuse Communion to the non-guilty parties in divorces.

'There must be thousands upon thousands of people like me. Fortunately, there are other incumbents who interpret differently the religious outlook on this question and who do not bar me from taking Communion.'

When an incumbent excommunicates a parishioner, the Rubric at the head of our service of Holy Communion obliges the incumbent

> 'to give an account of the same to the Ordinary within fourteen days after at the farthest. And the Ordinary shall proceed against the offending person according to the Canon.'

The Ordinary in this case is the Rt. Rev. R. C. Mortimer Bishop of Exeter, and we may be sure that the Rev. S. L. Landon has already made the required report to his Ordinary and in consequence a very serious responsibility rests on the Bishop of Exeter, who is not only Mr. Landon's bishop but also is the patron of Mr. Landon's living and appointed him to it.

Should the Bishop of Exeter condone Mr. Landon's action — although it is hardly imaginable that he should do so — he will not be able to protect Mr. Landon from the very serious penalties which he has invited by his illegal action. In the *Modern Churchman*, Vol. XLII, p. 309, December, 1952, we wrote by way of warning:

> 'Should an incumbent of the "rigorist" school repel such a person from Holy Communion, the following legal decisions should help the incumbent to realise the heavy penalties he may incur should the repelled parishioner decide to take legal action against him.
>
> Extracts from the judgment of the House of Lords in the case of Banister *v.* Thompson, June 20th, 1912. (Law Cases. Courts of Appeal. House of Lords. 1912. p. 539 *et seq.*)
>
> *Lord Loreburn*
>
> "The rights of parishioners in this matter depend primarily upon statute 1 Edw. VI, c.1, under which the incumbent of a parish may not without lawful cause, deny the Holy Communion to any parishioner who would devoutly and humbly desire it."
>
> "It is inconceivable that any court of law should allow as a lawful cause the cohabitation of two persons whose union is directly sanctioned by Act of Parliament and is as valid as any other marriage within the realm."
>
> *Lord Halsbury*
>
> "Everybody would have understood, and I think everybody now would understand, what was the meaning of 'persons of notorious evil life', and to say that that language is appropriate to these persons, who are legally married and whose marriage is absolutely established by Act of Parliament, would, as it seems to me, if it were not so serious a matter, be ludicrous."
>
> *Lord Ashbourne*
>
> "I think that the difficulty of the clergyman would be overwhelming who sought openly in the church to repel, against their respective protest, from the Holy Table such spouses as 'open and notorious evil-livers'

on the sole ground that they were living together as man and wife in accordance with the law of the land — it may be after being married in church by another clergyman — and although the congregation, so far from being offended, held them in respect and esteem. It might be that they had been married in the very church and had subsequently on previous occasions without question partaken of the Holy Communion.'' '

These three weighty deliverances have a direct bearing on the ase of Commander Walter Raleigh Gilbert. Should Commander ilbert take action accordingly he would deserve the gratitude, ot only of Liberal Churchmen, but of many who would make no aim to that designation. We realize that such action would be very istasteful and financially exacting, but the cause of freedom for ie laity within the Church of England seems to us to demand it.

Clerical Conscience and its Problems

The Rev. S. L. Landon's conscience, which he claims has mpelled him to refuse Holy Communion to Commander Gilbert, resents a problem which cannot be ignored. Let it be granted at ie outset that no one is morally justified in acting deliberately gainst his conscience. On the other hand a man may be doing rong when he acts in accordance with his conscience. Appalling rrors have been enacted by men in obedience to their conscience.

Mr. Landon claims that his conscience compels him to be loyal Christ's teaching in *Mark* x, 2-12 and that there our Lord definely declares that to marry a divorced man or woman (presumably hile the partner of their former marriage is still living) is to commit adultery. This teaching, ascribed to Jesus in *Mark*, is supported by *Luke* (xvi, 18) and by St. Paul in I *Cor.* vii, 10 f. *Mt.*, wever, in the Sermon on the Mount (v, 31 f.) and in xix, 9 permits an exception in the case of infidelity (*porneia*). St. Paul also llowed an exception in the case of a Christian husband or wife vorced by a Pagan partner. (I *Cor.* xvii, 15).

These two notable New Testament exceptions to Christ's solute teaching on the indissolubility of marriage indicate that is teaching was taken as expressing a principle or an ideal of arriage rather than as a legislative enactment. If such exceptions ere authorized in Apostolic times and by Apostolic authorities ay it not be permissible for the Christian Church, in the interest Christian welfare, to permit exceptions to-day?

There is another point which deserves Mr. Landon's reinsideration. He is reported as speaking of the Holy Communion Table in his church as ' my altar,' but it is, of course, as he ould acknowledge, pre-eminently the Lord's Table. If this be so

the question arises: Is the practice of excommunication in harmony with the general tenor of our Lord's teaching and spirit? 'He that cometh unto Me, I will in no wise cast out.' May it not be that the Christian Church in practising excommunication has derived it from Jewish Rabbinism and not from the Lord? We can find nothing in our Lord's undoubted teaching which authorizes excommunication. (*Mt.* xviii, 17 is not an utterance of the Friend of Publicans and Sinners.)

'Over-regulation'—the Church's Danger

Dr. A. T. P. Williams, ten years Headmaster of Winchester, then Dean of Christ Church, then Bishop of Durham, now Bishop of Winchester, addressing the Convocation of Canterbury at its recent session uttered a warning against 'over-regulation' by the Church authorities.

This warning against 'over-regulation' was uttered in connection with the somewhat futile discussion of what ought to be the Church's pastoral treatment, or ill-treatment, of divorcees desirous of hallowing their marriage by a service in church after their legal marriage by the State Registrar. The Northern Convocation took the view that this pastoral duty was best left in the hands of the parish priest, who is its legal administrator, and declined to interfere. But the Southern Convocation was less self-restrained.

'Over-regulation' is no novelty in the history of religion and not least in the history of the Christian Religion. Christ, both in speech and practice, protested against it incisively. 'Over-regulation' is a symptom of moral and spiritual decrepitude. Unfortunately it is too often interpreted as a product of Christian vitality and vigour. This 'over-regulation' becomes all the more deceptive and dangerous when it is advocated under the slogan of 'Church Reform' and disciplinary 'tightening-up'. In these days when our Church's situation makes such large demands on the experimental initiative, enterprise and energy of the parochial clergy, the fewer the regulations which restrict them the better. In the past the influence of the English clergy has been due in no small degree to the freedom which they, as individuals, have enjoyed. The parson's freehold has extended far beyond the limits of his glebe. But our present day 'Life and Liberty' movement aims ultimately at changing all that. It is the development of the 'over-regulation' spirit which has led the Church into its dangerous, and we fear disastrous, attempt to revise our Canons.

It was the ill-advised creation of the Canons of 1603 under James I and the ill-judged attempt to use them to 'tighten-up'

Puritan church life which led to Archbishop Laud and Charles I losing their heads. Laud's policy of 'thorough' created the Puritan policy of 'root and branch'. May it not be that in our own day the attempt to revise and enforce these canons will bring similar unforeseen disaster to our Church and State?

Although *The Canon Law of the Church of England* — the Report of the Archbishops' Commission on Canon Law published in 1947 by the S.P.C.K. — contains much valuable information it does not tell us explicitly who originated this movement for Canonical Revision. The Archbishops' Commission was appointed in 1939 when Archbishop Lang was Primate (its first session was held in 1943). In the list of the learned commissioners leading Evangelicals and Liberals are conspicuous by their absence. This would seem to indicate that the movement for revision originated in Anglo-Catholic circles. This inference is supported by an examination of the more important emendations and additions so far achieved in the process of revision. We ought to add that although Dr. Fisher was Archbishop of Canterbury when the Report of 1947 was published its Foreword is contributed by the Chairman of the Commission, Dr. Garbett, Archbishop of York. Happily the revision is at present only exploratory: the Royal assent has neither been sought nor given. Under the circumstances might it not therefore be better to reconsider whether it is worth while to proceed with the revision of the Canons of 1603? The Bishop of Winchester's warning of the danger of 'over-regulation' is particularly significant at the present time, especially when addressed to our Bishops.

The Bishops of Winchester have acquired a reputation for anticipating the views of authority when voicing their own.

Revision of the Canons of 1603 in Retrospect

On February 27th, 1948, the Council of the Modern Churchmen's Union passed unanimously the following resolution:

> 'That the attempt to promulgate a revised code of Canons is singularly ill-timed, because the country and the Church are passing through a period of change which before its conclusion may easily render revisions out-of-date, and because some of the proposed changes are highly contentious both in their effect and in the principles on which they are based, so that a revision of Canon Law will rather arouse opposition than promote uniformity.'

In the light of what has happened since 1948 in the sphere of canonical Revision this statement must appear prophetic (*Modern Churchman*, Vol. XXXIII, p. 5). In the same issue of the *Modern*

Churchman we claimed the support of *Theology* for our point of view. Its editor, Dr. Vidler, asserted that he was

> 'by no means convinced that the time is ripe for what the Commissioners recommend. Would anything substantial be gained if it were given legislative effect? We doubt it.
>
> 'At the back of the Canons to which we are alluding are theological principles concerning which it is notorious or it ought to be notorious that convictions in the Church of England are deeply divided. More harm than good would be done by any endeavour to press through new legislation on these subjects before both the clergy and the laity as a whole have been convinced that it is right and have a sufficient understanding of the principles on which it is grounded.'

In view of this situation Dr. Vidler proposed :

> '(1) That the actual revision of the Canon Law should be postponed *sine die*, and meanwhile
>
> (2) That the Church's legislative organs should first be reformed'.

Dr. Vidler concludes as follows :

> 'The truth is that the Church of England is not now in a period of theological or social stability but in a period of theological upheaval and incalculable social change. There could scarcely be a less suitable moment for attempting to stabilize its law.' (*Theology*, September, 1947 : p. 321 f.)

Nothing has happened, since Dr. Vidler's expression of his objection to the impediments which confront canonical revision, to weaken the force of his *caveat*.

In our review of *The Canon Law of the Church of England*, we wrote in July, 1948 :

> 'To-day in the sphere of the religious life our administrators have surely been led to recognise that the true remedy for religious disorders is education, not legislation . . .
>
> It is difficult to see what really worth having the Church of England will secure by the authorization of the Canons of 1603, revised and augmented. Will such authorization secure a higher standard of matrimonial morality? Will it secure a better body of English Diocesan Bishops? Will it secure more modern forms of Public Worship? Will it secure better relations with the Free Churches? Will it secure larger-minded and more judicious decisions in ecclesiastical lawsuits? We venture to assert that in none of these spheres would the authorization of these revised and augmented Canons benefit the Church of England and expand its moral and spiritual influence with the nation.' (*Modern Churchman*, Vol. xxxvi, p. 103.)

In a paper read before the Modern Churchmen's Conference in 1947 at Westfield College, London, we said :

> 'The general tendency of the reforms embodied in these Revised Canons is, as might be expected, Anglo-Catholic in its ideals and methods.' (p. 326).

After citing examples of this sinister aspect of canonical revision we concluded as follows :

> ' It is difficult to see what really good results will be secured by prohibiting members of the Society of Friends and members of the Salvation Army from being married in the Church of England or by debarring them from acting as sponsors at a Christian Baptism when it should be remembered that those baptized are being admitted, not into the Church of England, but into the Church of Christ.' (p. 327).

What has taken place since 1948 in the sphere of revision of the Canons has only increased our sense of apprehension.

Archbishop Davidson's comfortable axiom : ' The longer it takes the better it will be ', promises to be no more true of the Revision of the Canons than it was true of the Revision of the Prayer Book (1928).

As The Archbishop of York Sees It

Dr. Garbett's seven-fold charge entitled *The Church of England To-day*[1] is significant. The Archbishop is a Liberal Catholic, which we may remark is not the same as a Catholic Liberal, but his charge is significant because its point of view is that of many of our younger clergy at the present time.

The Archbishop holds fast to the traditional ' Catholic ' institutions as *essentials* and, therefore, that they ought to be enforced by Church authority as necessary for Church membership. The Archbishop regards these Catholic institutions as of the *esse* of the Church, whereas the Catholic Liberal regards them as the Church's *bene esse* if used in the right way and therefore as voluntary and also as adjustable to social and individual circumstances. Deep down the Archbishop believes that the way to Christianize the English nation is to Catholicize the National Church. On the other hand the Catholic Liberal holds that there are many ways of Christianizing the English people and that all these methods may be used in co-operation. The Archbishop fears that the National Church may become a Cave of Adullam; yet we ought not to forget that if there had been in Israelite history no Cave of Adullam there would have been no Throne of David. It was St. Augustine, unsurpassed as a Catholic statesman, who described the Catholic Church as a *corpus permixtum;* in other words, a Cave of Adullam. Augustine's policy was : Get

[1] *The Church of England To-day,* by Cyril Garbett, Archbishop of York (Hodder and Stoughton, 1953 ; 3/6).

them in and keep them in; and that will benefit both them and the Church. The Archbishop writes:

> 'But if a society has rules which must be kept by its members, it has also the right to impose penalties for their breach, and in cases of exceptional gravity to expel the offender. The Divine Society has this power in the form of excommunication. . . . The Church of England relies less on external discipline than on its members exercising self-discipline by repentance for past sin and amendment for the future. . . . Our Church insists on the necessity of confession, but normally it is that of the individual judging and examining himself, confessing his sins to God and receiving in faith God's absolution either secretly in his own room, or in the absolution pronounced by the priest to the congregation who have just confessed their sins.
>
> But our Church also realises that there will always be some who need special help to deepen their penitence and a specific and authoritative assurance of forgiveness. While, therefore, it gives no priest the right to insist on confession before him as a condition of forgiveness, every priest ought to know how to hear a private confession, and every confirmed member of the Church should know how to make his confession. . . . Long experience has convinced me that every Confirmation candidate should be taught what is meant by private confession' (p. 56 f.).

Our Tudor Reformers, who knew a great deal about *compulsory* auricular confession, abolished it but permitted private confession in exceptional cases. The emphasis which the Archbishop places on auricular confession will be regarded by some as an advance towards making it compulsory or as so desirable that not to practise it is to come short in our church life. We have known highly experienced priests who have become convinced that the general practice of auricular confession can be detrimental to the moral and spiritual life. *Abusus non usum tollit.*

We cite another example of pastoral Catholicizing by the Archbishop. Dealing with the practice of infant baptism he writes:

> 'An increasing number of clergy feel that baptism under modern conditions has become a mere form and is often a cause of scandal, and I am frequently asked to give advice on its administration. This I propose now to do.
>
> First, to refuse to baptise an infant is a grave responsibility for any priest to undertake. It may mean that the child is never baptised, and the refusal may have been made in such terms as to alienate the parents permanently from the church.
>
> Secondly, save in exceptional cases and in great emergency, the parish priest should insist on due notice. If after inquiries or from his own knowledge he discovers that the parents and godparents are non-practising church members, he should postpone the baptism until he has been able to give necessary instruction to the godparents, or until others more suitable are found. But if such postponement is necessary he must explain with patience and sympathy his reasons for it.

Thirdly, if no suitable godparents can be found by the parents, the parish priest should do what he can to find them. In a large parish some of the teachers at the kindergarten or infant school would often be ready to act as sponsors; the child's name should be entered on the Sunday School roll, and he should be visited every birthday until old enough to join the school.

Fourthly, the incumbents of a rural deanery should agree to act together, so as to avoid any parish becoming a Cave of Adullam to which the dissatisfied bring their children for baptism' (p. 49 f.).

The Archbishop's first counsel is invaluable but for his second hird and fourth counsels we could wish with all respect that he ad omitted them.

The Christian education of the child depends first on the arents, secondly on the school (day school and Sunday school). rovided we can get the parents to become godparents the hurch should allow unfettered freedom in the selection of the her godparents.

A plain, practical, impressive 'Baptism of Infants' at a ildren's service on a Sunday afternoon can be a most helpful ethod of teaching both the children and their elders the value of nfant Baptism.

The Archbishop's charge has a special value as the Charge of Liberal Catholic, but it ought to be recognized that Catholic iberals and Protestant Liberals are as needful as the Liberal atholic for the effective influence of the National Church in hristianizing the English people.

IN MEMORIAM

ALICE ASHLEY

1891—1953

BY the death of Miss Ashley the Council of the Modern Churchmen's Union has suffered a serious loss.

Her parents were devoted members of our fellowship and gular attendants at our annual conferences. Her father, Sir illiam Ashley, Vice-Principal of Birmingham University, and pupil of Jowett of Balliol, was a distinguished economic his- ian. His *Introduction to English Economic History and eory* and *The Bread of Our Forefathers* are classics in our cial history. But for Ashley, a nation's religion was not less portant than its economics. His volume *The Christian Outlook*

[1] *William James Ashley,* a Life by his daughter Anne Ashley, with a pter by J. H. Muirhead, Emeritus Professor of philosophy in the Univer- of Birmingham, and a foreword by the Rt. Hon. Stanley Baldwin, M.P. S. King, London; 1932).

(Longman's, 1925) subheading 'The Sermons of an Economist,' demonstrates and illustrates this.

Her mother, the daughter of Birkbeck Hill, Fellow of Lincoln College, one of our great authorities on Dr. Johnson and his contemporaries, was a notable modern-minded schoolmaster, and his daughter was educated on the same lines as his boy pupils. If it be true, as indeed it is, that our education begins with the education of our parents, Alice Ashley made a very promising educational start.

After taking her degree at Newnham College, Cambridge (1913), and spending a year at Bryn Mawr College U.S.A. (1914), she entered the educational profession, holding posts successively in Darlington, Edgbaston, Rochester and Halifax, and was appointed Head Mistress of Honor Oak School in 1931, which she held until her resignation in 1951. The quality of her leadership and the success of her many-sided administrative activities are recorded in the Honor Oak School Magazine 1951 (No. 31). Her educational ideal was supremely aesthetic. In the public address delivered on her appointment in 1931, she expressed it thus:

> 'Plato thought that from perception of the beautiful intransient forms, the soul, by slow degrees might ascend to a comprehension of ideal beauty. The full realization of this is too hard for us, but the earlier stages of its progress may perhaps be accomplished here. And within the term of beauty we include the recognition of real worth in human conduct, a recognition to which the mind may be awakened by the humane arts of literature and history. And from such recognition will grow a widening sympathy and a readiness to grasp another's point of view.'

But as a sound educationalist, Alice Ashley realized that the aesthetic had to be disciplined by the demands of the rational which are both intellectual and ethical.

> 'An essential function of education is to help towards the development of those powers of judgement and of clear and rational thought which are so necessary for the right conduct of life. This aim lies at the back of our work in science and mathematics.'

Miss Ashley's varied activities are thus summarized in the Honor Oak School Magazine recording her retirement:

> 'She served on the Executive Committee of the Association of Head Mistresses for four years, represented them on the School Broadcasting Council for some years, and on the Council for the Overseas Settlement of British Women. She was also on the Education Sub-Committee of the London Branch of the Association of Head Mistresses for seven years, for the last two of which she was chairman. During the war she was first secretary and then chairman of the London Joint Four, an

later represented them on the 'Furniture and Equipment' Sub-Committee of the L.C.C. She has twice served on the local selection committee, once as a chairman. She was a member of the consultative committee of head teachers (Camberwell), and was for two years their representative on the central consultative committee. Added to this she was on the Executive Committee of the U.G.S., and on the Council of the Modern Churchmen's Union.'

One who had been her fellow-worker during the long period of er Honor Oak Headship writes, and with her verdict we conclude ur commemoration of one whom her fellow members of the Iodern Churchmen's Union will greatly miss.

'It would not be possible to work with Miss Ashley for twenty-one years . . . without becoming aware of certain principles and ideals which have inspired and directed her. One thinks of her great love of the beautiful, natural beauty, beauty in art and in literature, beauty in human conduct and character. How many of our minor failings are just 'spoiling the beauty of our grounds, or our School, or even our personal appearance'! How many times is our prayer, 'Show us, O Lord, what true beauty is,'—for a great amount of thought and preparation have always gone into the planning of School Prayers—planning in which for many years now a committee of staff and girls has been invited to join. Then one realizes that Miss Ashley was ahead of the Norwood Committee in recognizing the great value of School Prayers and, indeed, of religion as a sound basis for all education.'

H.D.A.M.

GILBERT COLERIDGE

1859—1953

THE Hon. Gilbert Coleridge who died on November 6, in his ninety-fifth year will be much missed as a Vice-president of e Modern Churchmen's Union. His legal knowledge, many-led experience of English life and 'sweet reasonableness' rried great weight in the Council of the Modern Churchmen's nion.

He was the son of the first Lord Coleridge, sometime Lord ief Justice whose mode of cross-examining the Tichborne imant secured a niche in *Punch's Memorabilia*:

Would you be surprised to learn
The Tichborne case is done
And that the claimant's proved to be
The late Sir Roger's son?

t it is even more significant that Gilbert Coleridge was the great at nephew of S. T. Coleridge, poet, philosopher and much e—a founder of English Modernism.

By profession a barrister, Gilbert Coleridge became Assistant ster of the Crown Office and was known in legal circles as aster Coleridge.' But taxing legal costs had much less interest

for him than many other activities. He was a notable skater and oarsman, a Shakespearean actor, but was best known as a sculptor —the most treasured of his effigies is the bust of S. T. Coleridge presented by him to Jesus College, Cambridge. He was also a man of letters and produced a number of most interesting monographs of which *Eton in the Seventies* will long survive.

For many years he was churchwarden of St. Anne's, Kew where before his day, Handel had been the organist.

Loyal to the creed of S. T. Coleridge, he was a lover of animals and birds as well as of men.

> 'He prayeth best, who loveth best
> All things both great and small.'

H.D.A.M.

H. J. TRUEMAN

1861—1953

HENRY Joseph Trueman passed away at Beaconsfield in his ninety-third year. He was a very old member of the Modern Churchmen's Union and attended the first annual Modern Churchmen's Conference at Ripon in 1914 before the First World War. In conjunction with the late H. F. Walker of Somerset House he played a very influential part in the creation and activities of the St. Albans' branch of the Modern Churchmen's Union. He contributed to the *Modern Churchman* in November, 1943, an 'In Memoriam' of Miss A. K. Walker (a friend of the Rev. Leslie Weatherhead) and also a very cultured and devoted member of the Modern Churchmen's Union. Two other of his contributions to our pages are 'The Modern Churchman and his Life of Devotion' (Vol. XIV) and 'Synesius and the Imagination' (Vol. XXXV).

The best tribute to his activity and influence in his later years is recorded in St. Margaret's Church Magazine (Tylers Green, Bucks.).

> 'A memorial service to the Rev. Henry Joseph Trueman was held on Sunday, October 18th, at Evensong. The service was conducted by the Vicar and the Rev. W. B. Houldey, who also read the lessons.
>
> 'The hymns "Fill thou my life, O Lord my God" and "Dear Lord and Father of mankind" were sung, and the choir rendered Bairstow's lovely anthem "Save us, O Lord."
>
> 'In the course of his address, the Vicar paid tribute to the great service Mr. Trueman had rendered to St. Margaret's during the period of Mr. Hayward's illness. Mr. Trueman had been a man of great gifts and his teaching was the outcome of his own experience. For him Christian living was a fresh and growing awarness of the love of God in Jesus Christ which should permeate all human relationships.'

H.D.A.M.

THE COMING REVIVAL OF LIBERALISM

By the Right Rev. Geoffrey Allen, Principal of Ripon Hall, Oxford.

In his recent book, *Liberties of the Mind*, Charles Morgan asks: 'When, in the distant future, historians sit down to write, what title will they give to the chapter which describes the second half of the twentieth century?'

He describes the assaults of tyranny on liberty, which have been so strong in our time, and with which the coming generation may still be faced; and he adds the comment, 'It is their life, not mine, that will carry the remaining burden of this century, and the re-enlightenment, if they can win it, will be their children's and perhaps their own reward.'

Twilight of Liberty

It is a bold prophecy under present conditions, and even he only ventures to make it in these tentative terms. Through most of our generation the trends have been toward an increase of authority and a decline of freedom in both political and religious fields. We have witnessed the rise of the Fascist, the Nazi and the Communist tyrannies, with all the enhanced techniques of modern propaganda with which tyranny can now control men's minds.

In the West, though we have preserved our democracy, the Liberal party has almost disappeared from Parliament; the Conservative and the Labour parties, while they may differ on many other matters, yet agree on the necessity for a large measure of centralised planning and control.

In religion it is the authoritarian forms of the Christian faith which have been in the ascendant. 'Puzzled People,' as a recent book called them, being too unsure or too weary to think for themselves, have turned for refuge to those who assure them that they will find certainty in an infallible Bible or an infallible Church.

If we speak of the coming Liberal Revival, it might seem that it can only be on the ground that the point of despair very often proves to be the point of hope. Yet there are signs on the horizon, little be no more than a cloud the size of a man's hand.

In theological study we may seen one such sign in the present interest in the doctrines of the Holy Spirit and of the Kingdom of God. Of the Holy Spirit it is written that He comes in freedom like the wind, which bloweth where it listeth, and that 'where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty.'

The Kingdom of God

We are beginning to rediscover that the Kingdom of God does not mean only or mainly a distant, static, future state, when God would have conquered all the forces of evil, and reign in perfection; that it means rather the dynamic kingship of the living God, entering an imperfect world here and now to lead it nearer to Himself.

If once we can pass from a theoretical study of these doctrines and allow them to become for us, as they were for the early Church, a present and a living experience, the liberal revival will be at hand.

A revival of the liberal spirit will mean a release of individual enterprise and initiative, alike in the realm of thought and in the realm of action. Of the need for liberalism in this sense Langmead Casserley has written in a recent book: 'What we really require is a plan to end all planning, the restoration of freedom, responsibility and initiative to the human person, the creation of a new kind of social order in which men once more expanding the area of their conscious experience, can realise what it means to be human beings.' (*The Retreat from Christianity*, p. 120.)

Liberalism means also that we become liberal in the other sense of the word, generous. If we would claim a freedom of initiative ourselves, we must respect a like freedom in others, and be ready to work in fellowship with those who may see some aspect of the Truth which we ourselves may have missed. Authoritarian systems of all kinds make for uniformity. Liberalism welcomes diversity; yet it should not for that reason mean a disintegrating individualism, but rather hold diversity together in a richer community than authority can ever attain.

Into New Paths

These are characteristics of the true liberal spirit, wherever and whenever it is found. In many other respects the liberalism of the future will of necessity be different from the liberalism of the past, since it is of the essence of liberalism to explore new ways in each generation. The revival when it comes will not be a mere repetition or resuscitation; it will be a rebirth of spontaneity facing the tasks not of yesterday, but of to-day and of to-morrow.

If people therefore ask, whither this new spirit of liberty may lead, we shall reply that we do not know, for by its very nature it will summon us to become again pioneers, who 'conquering holding, daring, venturing,' will hear and obey the call of God to 'go the unknown ways.'

In the religious field we can indeed see certain tasks which require a release of new vision and new enterprise. Such for instance are the issues of reunion; the revision of our forms of worship; experiment in parochial organisation, in a world where residence now counts for much less, and functional groups for much more, as the basis of fellowship; the synthesis of theological insight with the new learning in psychology and sociology; the tensions of race, and of nationalism and internationalism.

In these and other spheres we need loyalty to all that is best in the heritage we have received from the past, but a freedom from timidity and prejudice, so that we are not bound by the past.

We need the faith to recognise that God, Who spoke to the prophets and Who guided the Church in its first days, is still the living Lord, Who may have a new purpose for His Church amid the history that is being built in our day.

Different Liberalism

We must not, however, prejudge what the purpose of God will be, for that would be to deny that God Himself is free. The awakening will come when we are humbled to acknowledge that the purpose of God may be beyond anything that we as yet had discerned, even with our most deep-rooted convictions or our holiest aspirations.

The creative newness of spirit, which is an essential characteristic of liberalism, has been noticed in two recent books, which are both in themselves signs of the coming revival. Karl Mannheim, discussing adult education in his book, *Freedom, Power and Democratic Planning*, wrote that 'no one can take for granted that what he has learned in his youth will carry him through life.'

Gordon Walker applies the lesson to liberalism itself in a significant passage in his book *Restatement of Liberty*. 'Freedom can be extinguished by tyrants; but it can also extinguish itself by the attempt to survive in outworn forms, thereby making the way smooth for the inmarch of tyrants.

'When a particular form of freedom has been called in question by the development of material, social or spiritual conditions, then the endeavour, however courageous it may be, simply to reassert freedom in its old outmoded forms is in the strict sense of the word reactionary—an archaic effort to return to the unrecoverable past.'

Let us notice a little further some of the ways in which the liberalism of to-morrow may differ from the liberalism of a generation ago. We have to learn that liberty thrives within the setting

of a respect for law, and that it is a false, or at least an immatur and adolescent liberalism, that thinks it must always be in revol against law and order. There are times when laws must b reformed, or even defied; but there are also times when for th very sake of liberty we must lend our energies to the upholding c law, both the moral law and the law of the land.

The Anglican Role

We have to learn the similar truth that if liberty is identifie with an unbridled individualism, then that path all too easily lead back through loneliness to a hunger for protection and a new sub mission to authority. The individual must affirm his liberty o judgment and of action, yet exercise that liberty for the buildin of community.

This is the theme of another important book on the recover of liberty, Erich Fromm's *The Fear of Freedom*. He writes, f instance, 'We believe . . . that man can be free and yet not alon critical and yet not filled with doubts, independent and yet a integral part of mankind.'

Our Anglican Church has at this point a very special rôle, ju because it holds together in one society the Catholic sense o the community of the Church and the Protestant sense of t freedom of the individual. It will not, however, fulfil its appoint rôle if Catholic and Evangelical live apart in separate groups mutual suspicion, but only in the measure that Catholics of liber sympathy and Evangelicals of liberal sympathy meet, and lea from one another, and together build the Church which compr hends the truths they each have seen.

The liberalism of the future will also have a deeper realis of the forces of evil, than did at times the liberalism of the pa At the beginning of the century both religious and politic liberalism were a little facile in their optimism. In religion v had learnt that the story of the Fall of Adam was myth, rath than exact history; we did not always go on to discern that myth it contained deep and abiding truths concerning the forc of evil, which dwell in the human soul and frustrate our be endeavours. In politics we thought that with universal suffrag and perhaps a little speeding up of universal education, a univer Utopia would shortly be within our grasp.

Shallow Pessimism

The two world wars shattered the illusions of those years the subsequent reaction, for a time it became a religious fashi

to revel in gloom. The day is coming when we must see that this recent fashion of pessimism is as shallow and ephemeral as was the earlier fashion of a too facile optimism.

Certainly any liberalism of the future must hear all that traditional theology or modern psychology or contemporary experience have to say about the fact of evil. Having done so, however, it will not remain pessimistic, but will go forward in new hope and commitment, confident that though the powers of evil are strong, yet the powers of God in Christ are abroad in the world, 'conquering and to conquer.'

We may sum up this change of spirit in the liberalism of to-morrow by saying that it will have felt the impact of the deeper theological tones, represented by Karl Barth and Emil Brunner on the Continent and Reinhold Niebuhr in America. Having learnt their lesson, however, we shall still remain liberal at heart, first because we shall know all the more surely that our hope is centred not in submission to any earthly authority, but in the living God.

Synthesis

This synthesis of orthodoxy with liberalism has already begun to come in America. In a recent Anthology of Essays (*Protestant Thought in the 20th Century*) Walter H. Horton, for instance, mentions the book *Liberal Theology, An Appraisal*, published in New York in 1942; he describes how John Bennett 'defends human nature and human reason against neo-orthodox pessimism, while acknowledging that earlier liberal optimism needed to be corrected by the tragic insight of Augustine, Luther and Calvin.'

Thus in America, as also in England, there is beginning to emerge a new liberalism, which accepts the deeper theological truth of the intractable elements of evil in human nature, but which is not for that reason left in gloom, because it also believes the message of the Gospel, that man is 'made free from sin,' and called 'to stand fast in the liberty wherewith Christ hath made us free.'

The doors are wide open for this synthesis of the so-called 'neo-orthodoxy' with a new liberalism, if we can achieve it. Over against the necessities of a measure of centralised planning in political and economic fields, we need through the whole life of society a new encouragement of individual enterprise and a recovery of individual spontaneity and initiative.

Over against the drabness of much modern life, and its resulting quest for adventure in second-hand escapist forms, we need a presentation of the Christian faith, which will show that every

moment of our life becomes an adventure of thought and action when we seek from hour to hour the will of the living God.

Party Spirit

Over against the hardening of party spirit as between differen groups in the Church (a hardening not unknown in the religiou Press), we need a recovery of a generosity of spirit, which wil lead Catholic and Protestant to look for the best, not the worst in each other, so that together they may rebuild the compreher siveness and unity of the Church.

Certainly the liberalism of to-morrow will have moved an grown, and in many ways be different from the liberalism o yesterday. Certainly we shall be humble to acknowledge place where such growth was necessary. If a liberalism of spirit were however, to die, it would be the death of the essential genius o our Anglican tradition, the death of one essential element whic our Church has contributed to the wider life of our nation, and th death of the spirit which is central in the faith we receive fro Christ.

If the liberal spirit has been weak in recent years, that ver weakness is a summons to pray and pledge ourselves for i revival. We shall not pray in vain, for Christ has not abandone His world; and of the Spirit of Christ it is written, 'if the So shall make you free, ye shall be free indeed.'

The above article which appeared in the *Church of England Newspap* of July 31, 1953, we have been permitted to republish with the kind conse of the Editor of the *Church of England Newspaper*.—Ed., *M.C.*

COURAGE AND SYSTEMATIC THEOLOGY

PAUL TILLICH'S EXISTENTIALIST APOLOGETIC

By Rev. C. J. Wright, B.D., Ph.D.,
Rector of Barfreystone, near Dover

WHAT has 'courage' to do with 'systematic theology'? Is not the general view held by educated and thoughtful people that 'systematic theology' is a survival of relics, recalling the ages which were closeted with dusty and imposed certainties; its neat and rounded body of final dogmas telling proudly, obediently, or complacently of a scheme that contained the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth? So that it can be dismissed without regret and with no sense of loss? 'A trouble of ants in the gleam of a million million of suns?' 'A murmur of gnats in the gloom, or a moment's anger of bees in their hive?'

And 'courage'? Is not its mark—to many modern minds, its sure and unmistakable mark—the refusal of all final systems? Are not these systems the infallible mark of the mentally, morally, and spiritually immature? The mark of the refusal to accept 'existentially' the infinite which hems us in on every side—of the refusal to submit to a Transcendent which over-passes all our fond wishes? And is not 'courage' always silent about itself?

The two books[1] before me stimulate these, and other, questions. Their author, Dr. Paul Tillich, is an influential German philosophic theologian who since the Nazi era has been teaching in America. A recent book of his in English, *The Protestant Era* (reviewed in *The Modern Churchman* for December, 1952) introduced his thought to some English readers of theological books. They are *The Courage to Be* and *Systematic Theology*. Very fittingly they have appeared in England almost simultaneously. Each is most relevant to the theme of the other. They help to interpret one another together with the situation which both of them reveal and both of them confront, in differing intent but by the same spirit. For anyone who would write truthfully a treatise under the title 'systematic theology' requires 'courage' of no common type. And any seriously and deeply thoughtful writer about 'courage' must seek to show its place and relevance in ordered thought about eternal things.

Let the slighter, but not less significant, book be considered first. It is called, not 'Courage,' but *The Courage To Be* — a title

[1] *Systematic Theology*, Vol. I, by Paul Tillich (Nisbet, 1953; 25/-). *The Courage to Be*, by Paul Tillich (Nisbet, 1952; 10/6).

which itself to the understanding reader reveals the mind of the author and the 'existential' thought-situation of our times. The book embodies the substance of the twenty-seventh series of lectures, delivered at Yale University in 1952, under the Foundation established at Yale by Dwight H. Terry. It is encouraging to note, in a day of mingled religious indifference and ill-at-ease theological illiberalism, that a condition pertaining to this Foundation is that the lectures should be concerned with 'religion in the light of science and philosophy': and that its lecturers should be in harmony with these two 'cardinal beliefs'—'loyalty to the truth, lead where it will, and devotion to human welfare.' Inseparable twins.

The whole book, I think, can be regarded as an interpretation and a re-interpretation, of 'faith' through a penetrating analysis of courage. The author's discussion is, to use his own language, 'an ontology of anxiety and courage.' Therein it reveals both the philosopher and the theologian: or rather, these two in their partnership in a clamant integrative task. The modes and moods of a very old concern under a comparatively new name—'existentialism'—is the dominating background of the lectures. For wherever and whenever there have been men who *really*, in the inmost heart, hated evil and really, *de coeur* (that is, with 'courage,' the Latin name for the inmost moral and spiritual qualities of the Anglo-Saxon 'heart') loved truth, the seeds of this 'existentialism' were being sown. I imagine that such prophetic men as Gautama Buddha, Jeremiah, and Socrates—not to speak of Him whom Christians regard as the crown of these as of their forerunners and successors—would have understood the thing, if not the name. All the prophets of all the 'faiths,' and of none of the 'faiths,' confronted and sought, with truth in the inward parts, to answer — with lip and with life — the question involved in individual human existence.

After an introductory chapter in which Dr. Tillich traces summarily his theme in the history of Western thought—through Plato, the Stoics, Aquinas, Spinoza and Neitzsche—he confronts the basic 'anxiety' of our times. To do this he takes his stand upon his own ground, which is a unification (suggested by the title *The Courage To Be*) of the ethical and the 'ontological' concept of courage.

> 'Courage as a human act, as a matter of valuation, is an ethical concept. Courage as the universal and essential self-affirmation of one's being is an ontological concept. The courage to be is the ethical act in which man affirms his own being in spite of those elements of his existence which conflict with his essential self-affirmation.'

Three types of anxiety are distinguished 'according to the three directions in which non-being threatens being.' They are 'the anxiety of fate and death,' 'the anxiety of emptiness and meaninglessness,' and 'the anxiety of guilt and condemnation.' (I must, as far as possible, in this discussion give the author's own words: though I cannot but regard it as unfortunate, as restricting his influence, that he uses so much obscure technical language.) 'In all three forms anxiety is existential in the sense that it belongs to existence as such and not to an abnormal state of mind as in neurotic (and psychotic) anxiety.'

When deeply and truly religious people to-day are 'anxious,' it is not, I think, because they can never forget that they will have to die. Nor is it because, I think, that they are concerned about future rewards and punishment. It is, I suggest, because they find it difficult at times to see any meaning in anything. For that reason it seems to me that, both for the truly religious person and for the unrepentant theological thinker, the type of 'anxiety' covered by the terms 'emptiness' and 'meaninglessness' is the one most relevant to our present situation. The rest of this discussion will be concerned with it. It is the main concern of both these books.

Dr. Tillich thus expounds his view of this:

> 'We use the term meaninglessness for the absolute threat of non-being to spiritual self-affirmation, and the term emptiness for the relative threat to it. . . . The anxiety of meaninglessness is anxiety about the loss of an ultimate concern, of a meaning which gives meaning to all meanings. This anxiety is aroused by the loss of a spiritual centre, of an answer, however symbolic and indirect, to the question of the meaning of existence.'

This sense of emptiness and of meaninglessness is very common among the sensitively and morally thoughtful of our times: both within and without *all* the churches, and both within and without all religions and faiths. It used to be termed 'doubt,' and in the Victorian era the theoretical 'ism' to express it was 'agnosticism.' Now 'doubt,' as Dr. Tillich recognises—and in this he is in the whole liberal sucession of every age and clime and faith—has both a creative and a destructive function in the highest life of man.

> 'This element of doubt is a condition of all spiritual life. The threat to spiritual life is not doubt as an element but the total doubt. If the awareness of not having has swallowed the awareness of having, doubt has ceased to be methodological asking and has become existential despair.'

Dr. Tillich's analysis here is penetrating and, as I believe, inescapable.

> 'On the way to this situation the spiritual life tries to maintain itself as long as possible by clinging to affirmations which are not yet undercut, be these traditions, autonomous convictions, or emotional preferences. And if it is impossible to remove the doubt, one courageously accepts it without surrendering one's convictions. One takes the risk of going astray and the anxiety of this risk upon oneself. In this way one avoids the extreme situation till it becomes unavoidable and the despair of truth becomes complete.'

Every thoughtful person knows in these days of totalitarian pressures and tricks that there are 'ways out.' There is what I would call the 'dogmatic' way out: that is, the surrender to an imposed authority, as in systems which either *claim* infallibility (like papalism or like scholastic Protestantism) or act coercively on the basis of an *implied* infallibility (as in all 'police states'). These personal statements may be permitted in this discussion. It is one of the great merits of Dr. Tillich that he himself sees things ecclesiastical, things theological, things philosophical, and things economic and political as related. And surely everyone who is fully alive—if we will; 'existentially' alive—must seek to see these things whole, and not in the compartments of impoverishing and impoverished isolated fragments.

Dr. Tillich analyses this 'way-out' thus:

> 'Doubt is based on man's separation from the whole of reality, or his lack of universal participation, on the isolation of his individual self. So he tries to break out of this situation, to identify himself with something trans-individual, to surrender his separation and self-relatedness. He flees from his freedom of asking and answering for himself to a situation in which no further questions can be asked and the answers to previous questions are imposed on him authoritatively. In order to avoid the risk of asking and doubting he surrenders the right to ask and to doubt.'

Such 'self-surrender' may deliver a person from loneliness, the loneliness of 'existential' doubt and despair. It involves what Dr. Tillich calls 'participation': and, I would add, a very partial and a very deceptive 'participation.' If some kind of 'meaning' is saved, the self is sacrificed. But, as I would venture to add, this is not sacrifice but suicide. And this 'meaning' is not 'certainty' but 'certitude'—the certitude of the loud drum, of the hypnotised crowd, of the sleeping-draught, or of the padded cell.

How obvious it is to those familiar with religious as well as with political history that this kind of 'participation' results very frequently in what Dr. Tillich calls a 'fanatical self-assertiveness.'

> 'Fanaticism is the correlate to spiritual self-surrender: it shows the anxiety which it was supposed to conquer, by attacking with disproportionate violence those who disagree and who demonstrate by their disagreement elements in the spiritual life of the fanatic which he must suppress in himself. Because he must suppress them in himself he must

suppress them in others. His anxiety forces him to persecute dissenters. The weakness of the fanatic is that those whom he fights have a secret hold upon him; and to this weakness he and his group finally succumb.'

regard this, in measure, as a true and just psychological analysis of every human flight from reason and freedom.

The more positive aspects of Dr. Tillich's teaching are found in his discussions on 'Courage and Participation,' 'Courage and Individualization,' and 'Courage and Transcendence.' The first type of courage has to do with a person's place in collectivist situations. This raises obviously a key issue for the individual in societies which are 'totalitarian.' To a lesser degree it is an issue for any person in any institution—as, for example, a 'Modern Churchman' amid the present institutional embodiments of English Christianity, to use an illustration which should mean something to my readers. As I read this chapter I found myself wishing that Dr. Tillich had, for a time, reliquished his abstract argumentations and had dealt with concrete situations confronting modern thinking, moral, and spiritual people: and, more especially, that he had, as a Christian theologian, confronted the specific problems of truth and unity in an individual's membership of any and every 'church'; instead of giving us the yet valuable discussion of U.S.S.R. and U.S.A. collectivist manifestations. What Dr. Tillich calls 'the courage to be as a part' leads, therefore, inevitably to what he calls 'the courage to be as oneself,' the second type of courage, elucidated in 'Courage and Individualization.'

Here the main issue is the whole modern Existentialist movement, which I envisage as the protest of the individual against the refusal of all societies, groups, institutions to be really concerned with truth. The movement, of course, is much more potent on the Continent than here in this island—due largely as I believe, to our national temperate and accommodating qualities of mind. The theologian will remember that it took a hundred years for Kierkegaard to receive any attention in this island. And very relevant, as I think, to the issue—Schleiermacher's main work was translated here as late as 1929. He, while far from any modern 'existentialism,' was yet the theological thinker who tried to teach the thinking church to take its stand on our inescapable individual human consciousness of and dependence upon final reality.

Dr. Tillich says of recent Existentialism:

'It has experienced the universal breakdown of meaning. Twentieth-century man has lost a meaningful world and a self which lives in

meanings out of a spiritual centre. But man is still aware of what he has lost or is continuously losing. He is still man enough to experience his dehumanization as despair. He does not know a way out, but he tries to save his humanity by expressing the situation as without an 'exit.' He reacts with the courage of despair, the courage to take his despair upon himself and to resist the radical threat of non-being by the courage to be as oneself. Every analyst of present-day Existentialist philosophy, art and literature can show their ambiguous structure: the meaninglessness which drives to despair, a passionate denunciation of this situation, and the successful or unsuccessful attempt to take the anxiety of meaninglessness into the courage to be as oneself.'

Strange as it will, no doubt, seem to many readers, the main issue for the theological and philosophical thinker is about 'Essence' and 'Existence.' Readers of the atheistic existentialist Sartre will remember how he emphasises the point that what atheistic existentialists, like himself, and Catholic existentialists have in common 'is simply the fact that they believe that *existence* comes before *essence*.' Dr. Tillich quotes Sartre's proposition that '*the essence of man is his existence*' and comments that this is 'the most despairing and the most courageous sentence in all Existentialist literature.' The most *revealing* sentence that I have found in Sartre is this—and it leads me at once to Dr. Tillich's, as I believe, main point. Sartre says that man '*is himself the heart and centre of his transcendence*,' and elucidates the saying in these words which I take from his *Existentialism and Humanism*: the most challenging modern words to sincere and honest Christian thinkers I have read.

'Existentialism is not atheist in the sense that it would exhaust itself in demonstrations of the non-existence of God. It declares, rather, that even if God existed that would make no difference from its point of view. Not that we believe God does exist, but we think that the real problem is not that of His existence; what man needs is to find himself again and to understand that nothing can save him from himself, not even a valid proof of the existence of God. In this sense existentialism is optimistic, it is doctrine of action, and it is only by self-deception, by confusing their own despair with ours, that Christians can describe us as without hope.'

This leads to Dr. Tillich's third type of courage (what he calls 'the Courage to accept acceptance'), his closing chapter on 'Courage and Transcendence,' and his *Systematic Theology*.

The real issue, I believe, is *Faith*, not I would emphasise, *the* faith. Religious thinkers in the specifically theistic tradition—Christians, Jews and Muhammadans—regard the nature and ground of Faith as bound up with belief *in God*. What is *the essence* of this theism? Or, if you will, its enduring substance? Or, if Dr. Tillich's language is preferred, what are its 'ontological principles'?

Very profound and far-reaching questions arise which I cannot even outline in this review-discussion. But I wish to emphasise the *heroic nature* of Dr. Tillich's apologetic. He grapples: he does not evade.

His position is that 'ontological principles have a polar character according to the basic polar structure of being, that of self and world.' That is seen in what he has called 'participation' and 'individualization.' He holds that 'the courage to be as a part,' carried through radically, leads to the loss of the self in authoritarian collectivisms: and that 'the courage to be as one-self,' again to radical thought, leads to the loss of the world in Existentialism. And his final position is that there is a 'courage to be' which unites both these forms of courage by transcending them. For it is 'rooted in being-itself': or, as we prefer to say, *in GOD* (not, please, *in God*, and certainly not in god), in G O D, the Ground of being-itself. If my readers will try to appreciate the distinctions I have ventured to draw by the use of 'GOD,' 'God' and 'god,' they will, I hope, be able to see the meaning of Tillich's crucial and vital closing sentence:

> *'The courage to be is rooted in the God who appears when God has disappeared in the anxiety of doubt.'*

The God of theism is transcended. 'God above God' is the ultimate source of revelation, as of 'the courage to be.' Not just a Book, or indeed many books of many faiths. And certainly not just an Institution or Church. Most certainly neither a single dogmatist or a single systematiser, nor a majority of dogmatists or of systematisers. Nor even a minority of religious founders or prophets. I am tempted to add—and I wish to make it clear that I am attempting elucidation and clarification and simplification, and am not citing Dr. Tillich's own words or specific statements—not even a minority of one: though we must wait until volume two of the *Systematic Theology* appears before so definite a Christological implication is affirmed—an affirmation which I myself believe to be faithful both to the Mission, Message and Person of Jesus and to its multiform expressions in the New Testament.

I must confine myself, in closing this discussion of the most significant books of philosophical religious thought which have come my way during the last thirty years, to three issues.

The first is the so-called 'kerygmatic theology.' Nothing is to be gained by recent attempts to isolate the 'kerygma' of the early Church from the teaching of Jesus Himself. Or, to state the issue in another way, to isolate the 'message' of the present Church from the 'reasons' for its acceptance. 'Fundamentalists in

America' and 'orthodox theologians in Europe' (I use Dr Tillich's terms) have more in common, I believe, than either will acknowledge. Some recent kerygmatic theologians regard all kinds of apologetic theology as 'a surrender of the kerygma,' so that 'the only real theology is kerygmatic theology.' Thus, as Dr. Tillich puts it, the message must be thrown at the thoughtful like a stone. Whether the stone finds a mark—whatever kind of mark—it implies nonsensical or impossible claims. For 'every kerygmatic theology must use the conceptual tools of its period.'

So this *Systematic Theology* before me is at the widest remove from any 'systematic theology' found on the top shelves of dusty libraries. It is no Scholastic *Summa Theologica*. Nor is it a Reformation *Institutio Religionis Christiana* or *Loci Communes*. I feel Dr. Tillich's treatise has much more in common with Schleiermacher than with any Scholastic, whether Catholic, Lutheran or Reformed. Indeed I would venture to suggest, with inevitable reservations, that Schleiermacher's 'feeling of absolute dependence' is not far removed from Dr. Tillich's 'ultimate concern about the ground and meaning of our being.' In that sense of 'existential', this 'Systematic Theology' is existential. 'The criterion of every theological discipline is whether or not it deals with the Christian message as a matter of ultimate concern.' It goes without saying that any such 'Systematic Theology' must be 'radically critical.' Its 'method of correlation' is a truthful endeavour to be faithful both to an eternal message and to this present temporal situation. Its 'material norm,' positive and constructive, is what is here called the '*New Being in Jesus as the Christ*.'

> 'If this is combined with the critical principle of all theology, one can say that the material norm of systematic theology to-day is the New Being in Jesus as the Christ as our ultimate concern.'

We must wait for a hoped-for critical and concrete and positive elucidation of this 'norm' in the second volume. Another severe test for 'The Courage To Be.'

The second issue I must mention, if but briefly, is that covered by Part I on 'Reason and Revelation.' The necessary distinction is drawn between 'Reason' and 'reasoning.' Few important terms are used with more confusion than 'Reason,' both by religious and by atheistic writers.

> 'In some forms of logical positivism the philosopher even refuses to "understand" anything that transcends technical reason, thus making his philosophy completely irrelevant for questions of existential concern.
>
> 'Theology cannot accept the support of technical reason in "reasoning" the existence of a god. Such a god would belong to the means-end

relationship. He would be less than God. On the other hand, theology is not perturbed by the attack on the Christian message made by technical reason, for these attacks do not reach the level on which religion stands. They may destroy superstitions, but they do not even touch faith.'

The discussion of 'Revelation' and especially 'Final Revelation' is subtle and very significant for this new apologetic. The effort is made to maintain the 'finality' of the revelation of New being in Jesus the Christ amid the many conflicting thought-tendencies of the times.

'Far from being heteronomous and authoritarian, final revelation liberates. "He who believes in me does not believe in *me*," says Jesus in the Fourth Gospel, destroying any heteronomous interpretation of his divine authority.'

My third and final issue is that confronted by Dr. Tillich in his part II, 'Being and God.' I must confine myself to two citations which, in the context of his thought, have interested me in the light of my own teaching experiences. The first is about MIRACLE (not 'miracles'): the second is about DOGMA.

'An especially weak and disgusting form of apologetics used the *argumentum ex ignorantia;* that is, it tried to discover gaps in our scientific and historical knowledge in order to find a place for God and his actions within an otherwise completely calculable and "Immanent" world.' 'The doctrine of the preservation of the world is the door through which deistic concepts easily creep into the theological system.'

'It is not always personal doubt that undermines and empties a system of ideas and values. It can be the fact that they are no longer understood in their original power of expressing the human situation and of answering existential human questions. This is largely the case with the doctrinal symbols of Christianity.'

Dr. Tillich, in my judgment, represents a significant philosophical stage, on the important field of America, in the slowly emerging liberation of religious thought and life from their dogmatic and authoritarian shackles.

SOME REFLECTIONS ON ROBERTSON OF BRIGHTON

died August 15th, 1853

by D. L. Scott, M.A., Rector of Creeton, Lincs.

WHEN F. W. Robertson died—he was only thirty-seve years old—the little world of Brighton, in which the las six years of his life had been spent, realized something of th loss it had sustained. At least it realized that it had lost a ver popular preacher, one who possessed a singularly attractiv and outspoken personality. But to the larger world outsid Brighton Robertson was practically unknown. Only one of h sermons had been published during his lifetime, and very littl besides. He preached as a rule from notes which were often dis carded before the discourse reached its end. His sermons woul thus have been lost for ever if he had not occasionally written ou what he could remember of them afterwards for the sake o obliging a friend, and still more if an appreciative member of h Brighton congregation had not taken down a number of them i shorthand at the time of their delivery.

These sermons were collected together, edited, and publishe in four volumes between 1855 and 1863. Two years later the were followed by the *Life of F. W. Robertson*, by Stopfor Brooke, who was then still an Anglican clergyman. It was th work which established the reputation of its author and subje alike. The criticism which has been levelled against it may b true, that Brooke—whose personal knowledge of Robertson wa confined to a few weeks spent in his company as a boy—impressed his own personality upon the portrait of his her Nevertheless it brought Robertson to fame and caused increasin attention to be turned towards his sermons.

Thus is came about that some ten or fifteen years elapse between the time of Robertson's Brighton ministry and h discovery by the Christian world in general. This interval important because during it the Broad Church movement ha become recognizable as such in a way that it was not Robertson's lifetime. Maurice's *Theological Essays* only ap peared in the year of Robertson's death, and Jowett's work o St. Paul's Epistles not until 1855. In fact it was not until th publication of *Essays and Reviews* in 1860, followed by th writings of Bishop Colenso in the years immediately thereafte that the emergence of a new school of Anglican liberalism becam

emonstrably and inescapably evident. This was the context
n which Robertson's works were published; it needs to be
emembered that it was in a very different context that they had
een composed.

Robertson went to Brighton in 1847. His sermons shew little
any change of outlook whether they belong to the beginning or
ne end of his Brighton ministry; so that we may say that by 1847
is outlook had reached maturity. It would still have been
together remarkable two decades later—indeed it was acknow-
dged to be so. But at least it was then no longer isolated.
solated, however, Robertson's whole standpoint most certainly
as in 1847, a time at which the Church of England had become
eculiarly arid. The older school of liberalism, or rather of
titude, had died out with the 'Noetics' of Oriel College who
ad been eclipsed by the rise of the Tractarian movement in
833. That movement had spent all its first force by 1847. Its
aders were perplexed and discomfited by Newman's secession
Rome, and some of them were preparing to follow his example.
n the other hand the Evangelical movement had long since
assed its prime, although it was presently to gain a notable
iumph by the Gorham Judgment in 1850. Indeed the whole six
ars that Robertson spent at Brighton were singularly unenligh-
ned, theologically speaking, by any leavening influences.[1] A
erile and unedifying cotroversy between the two main parties
the Church held the field, from which a practical form of relief
as found in the energetic pursuit of Church building in the
owing industrial towns of Victorian England, and of Church
storation in the villages—an occupation which Westcott
served to be characteristic of ages of spiritual decline. Yet it
as against this bankground that Robertson was offering to the
opkeepers, *rentier* spinsters and 'servants and handmaidens'
Brighton—in an environment which surely contained the very
intessence of that stifling aridity and sterility just alluded to—
spiritual gospel which rose above the shibboleths of controversy
th a clear message of illumination and reconciliation.

The strength of Robertson's teaching may be said to have
nsisted in three things. First, it rested upon a sound theologi-
foundation. It was in fact thoroughly dogmatic, not of course
any narrow sense, for Robertson was never content to leave

[1] This is not forgetting the influence exercised by e.g. Coleridge, or Words-
rth, or (a little later) by Tennyson whose 'In Memoriam' was described by
obertson himself as the most precious thing of the century. Yet the fact that
Times could severely criticize its 'irreverence' shows how restricted such
uence was.

the truth encased in petrified formulae, but in the sense that h never wavered from the conviction that living truth is inspired b the living God. This meant that although he might appeal to th emotions as well as to the reason of his hearers, he was never i danger of expounding to them a mere sentimental humanism t which belief in God was no more than an optional appendage That belief was integral and essential to the whole of Robertson' thought, and his whole teaching was unmistakably the expressio of it.

But, in the second place, no less unmistakable was his belie in the full and true humanity of Jesus Christ. 'Think of Chris as a man first of all,' he said, 'love Him first as the Son of Man then you will come to adore Him as the Son of God.' While i one of his most famous sermons, 'The Glory of the Virgi Mother,' he sets forth his belief that Christ's manhood was n only universal in its character, 'but also His heart had in it th blended qualities of both sexes . . . —the manly and the feminin In the character of Christ neither was found exclusively but bot in perfect balance. He was the Son of Man—the human being- perfect Man.' It is true that this might seem to make the humani of Jesus impersonal, and therefore not really humanity at all; b it is also true that in point of fact Robertson was wiser than h knew, since, according to modern biology, a being which w exclusively male or female would not be a perfect representati of its sex, but a monstrosity. It is not, however, the technic niceties of his Christology that are important, but the simple fa that Robertson was intensely concerned with Christ's manhood a time when this was so largely ignored by all save Unitaria and agnostics. 'The glory of the life of Jesus to us is, that it full of the Human,' he declared in 1848. But it was a glo visible to few at that time. Nearly twenty years later Dr. Lidd was still seeking to prove in his Bampton Lectures the omnip tence and omniscience of the Incarnate, leaving to his humani only such illusory room as these attributes of divinity allowed.

The third characteristic of Robertson's teaching was h insistence that truth lies not in compromise but in comprehensi This is well illustrated by what he says at the beginning of t first of his sermons on Baptism:

> 'Wherever opposite views are held with warmth by religious-mind men, we may take for granted that there is some higher truth wh embraces both. All high truth is the union of two contradictories . . . with the opposing views of baptism. Men of equal spirituality are rea to sacrifice all to assert, or to deny, the doctrine of baptismal regenerati And the truth, I believe, will be found, not in some middle, modera

> timid doctrine, which skilfully avoids extremes, but in a truth larger than either of these opposite views, which is the basis of both, and which really is that for which each party tenaciously clings to its own views, as to a matter of life and death.'

The 'high truth' in this instance was the 'Eternal Fact of God's Paternity'—the truth that whether he knows it or not, man is God's child. Baptism is the declaration and revelation that this is so. Robertson's comparison of it to Coronation, which *makes* the Sovereign as Baptism *makes* the child of God, is probably the most familiar and one of the most striking points of his teaching.

It was then upon this threefold foundation that Robertson gave to the Christian Gospel an interpretation that was broad, coherent and satisfying to a remarkable degree; an interpretation which avoided the Scylla of a shallow rationalism no less than the Charybdis of a moribund fundamentalism—those twin hazards upon which so many thoughtful souls were foundering. James Anthony Froude, whose *Nemesis of Faith* appeared in 1849, is a good example. There is no suggestion in that book that its author had the least awareness that a form of Christianity liberal and yet orthodox was in any way possible—such a form as was being expounded at that very moment in Brighton. It was in fact in the years 1849—1850 that Robertson's powers were at their zenith and some of his greatest sermons were preached. (In December 1849 he gave fifteen different addresses in all.) Free himself from the tortuous meshes of bibliolatry he was eager that others should no longer be ensnared by them. He made a careful study of biblical criticism, so far as it had then advanced, commending its results in special series of addresses on Fridays and Sunday afternoons. He explained the composite character of the Pentateuch, and while accepting the Mosaic authorship of its present form he did not hesitate to say that it contained much material that was frankly legendary. Thus in a sermon on wrestling Jacob, he bluntly told his congregation, 'Much of the story is evidently mythical.'

> 'It is clear at once,' he said, 'that it belongs to that earlier period of literature when traditions were preserved in a poetical shape, adapted to the rude conceptions of the day; but enshrining an inner and a deep truth. To disengage this truth from the form in which it is encased, is the duty of the expositor.'

Yet fourteen years later the Bishop of Manchester (Prince Lee) was speaking for the majority of his brethren when he declared:

> 'All our hopes for eternity, the very foundations of our faith are taken from us, if one line of that Sacred Book be declared to be unfaithful or untrustworthy.'

Nor was Robertson's teaching any less explicit upon the Atonement — another stumbling-block to many and one which especially lent itself to the preacher who was content to darken counsel by taking refuge in vague and mystical language.

> 'Let no man,' says Robertson, 'say that Christ bore the wrath of God. Let no man say that God was angry with His Son. We are sometimes told of a mysterious anguish which Christ endured, the consequence of Divine wrath, the sufferings of a heart laden with the conscience of the world's transgression, which He was bearing as if they were His own sins. Do not add to the Bible what is not in the Bible . . . Christ came into collision with the world's evil, and He bore the penalty of that daring . . . It is the law which governs the conflict with evil. It can be only crushed by suffering from it. The Son of man who puts His naked foot on the serpent's head, crushes it: but the fang goes into His heel.
>
> 'The Redeemer bore imputed sin. He bore the penalty of other's sin. He was punished. Did He bear the anger of the Most High? Was He the hell of an accusing conscience? In the name of Him who is God, no Caiaphas, never.'[2]

The preacher concludes:

> 'Estimate rightly the Death of Christ. It was not simply the world's example—it was the world's sacrifice. He died not merely as a martyr to the Truth. His death is the world's life . . . The spirit of Caiaphas was death: to receive all and give nothing: to sacrifice others to himself. The Spirit of Christ was life; to give and not receive: to be sacrificed and not to sacrifice . . . By realizing that ideal of humanity, Christ furnished the life which we appropriate when we enter into His Spirit.
>
> 'Only by renouncing sin is His death to sin yours—only by quitting it are you free from the guilt of His blood, only by voluntary acceptance of the law of the Cross, self-surrender to the will of God, and self-devotion to the good of others as the law of your being, do you enter into that present and future heaven which is purchased by His vicarious sacrifice.'

Christ's voluntary sacrifice of perfect obedience is a theme to which Robertson often returns. At the close of a sermon on the Good Shepherd, he asks:

> 'How could the Father be *satisfied* with the death of Christ, unless He saw in the sacrifice mirrored His own love?—for God can be satisfied only with that which is as perfect as Himself. Agony does not satisfy God—agony only satisfied Moloch. Nothing satisfies God but the voluntary sacrifice of Love. The pain of Christ gave God no pleasure—only the love that was tested by pain—the love of perfect obedience. He was obedient unto death.'

It is worth noting, perhaps, that Robertson said this within a few months of his own death, when mortal agony was already his almost constant companion.

[2] Sermon on 'Caiaphas' view of vicarious sacrifice.'

The torment of hell was another controversial issue—a burning question both literally and figuratively—upon which the Brighton preacher had expressed himself clearly several years before F. D. Maurice was deprived of his London professorship for challenging the traditional view of endless punishment.

> 'The circles of hell and the mountain of purgatory,' said Robertson, 'are as fabulous to us as the Tartarus to the heathens.'

After pointing out that in Dante's picture of hell there is not the idea of mental suffering, 'that it is all bodily, awful, intolerable torture,' he says:

> 'Now all this we believe no longer . . . Scripture language is symbolical. There is no salt, no worm, no fire, no torture. I say not that a diseased soul may not form for itself a tenement hereafter, as here, peculiarly fitted to be the avenue of suffering; but unquestionably we cannot build upon these expressions a material hell.'[3]

The miraculous element in the Gospels Robertson accepted without questioning its complete historicity. But 'miracles,' he said, 'have only done their work when they teach us the glory and the awfulness that surround our common life.' The stress he laid upon Christ's humanity caused him to turn with revulsion from the idea that only in the working of miracles was His divinity to be seen. This he described as

> 'a strange, and low, and vulgar appreciation of the true glory of the Son of God, the same false conception that runs through all our life, appearing in every form—God in the storm, and the earthquake, and the fire—no God in the still small voice. Glory in the lightning-flash—no glory and no God in the lowliness of the dew-drop. Glory to intellect and genius—no glory to gentleness and patience. Glory to every kind of *power*—none to the inward, invisible strength of the life of God in the soul of man.'[4]

Hence from his belief in the Incarnation there naturally followed the belief that God's presence is immanent in all material things. It had proclaimed God's property in all places.' The bread and wine were 'chosen by God for the emblems of His sacraments because the commonest things of daily life were filled with the presence of His love.' The keeping of Sunday was to be a sign that all time belongs to God and is all, therefore, sacred. So also there is nothing that is wholly and utterly bad. That there is 'a soul of goodness in things evil' is a thought to which Robertson frequently recurs.

These examples show how much he had in common with the Broad Churchmen of the eighteen sixties, although the controversies of that period would probably have been as distasteful to

[3] Sermon on 'The Pharisees and Saducees at John's baptism.'
[4] Sermon of 'The glory of the divine Son.'

him as they were to F. D. Maurice,[5] and like Maurice he woul perhaps have sought to dissociate himself from them. But in fac the influence of Robertson had made itself deeply felt, and upo one in particular of the leading figures of that time of theologica upheaval. This was Bishop Colenso, whose outlook—not c course with regard to Pentateuchal criticism, but generally—owed much, on his own confession, to Robertson's sermons an Stopford Brooke's biography. No doubt the Bishop expresse himself more crudely; but when one of his South African accuser felicitously asserted that 'he confuses between grace and natur in the spirit of a pure Pantheist, and, to use the language c Holy Scripture, he throws the children's bread, which God give to His own in Sacraments, to dogs and swine'—Robertson, wh had insisted that every child is born the child of God, that baptism is the Church's authoritative declaration of what is true already would undoubtedly have fallen under the same condemnation.

Yet at the same time the differences between Robertson an most other liberal theologians of the mid-nineteenth century ar not less important than their points of resemblance. The cas against theological liberalism to-day rests largely upon its allege association with an easy optimistic belief in human progress an with a secularized humanism which has little to do with essentia Christianity. That many Victorian Broad Churchmen did shar heartily in the spirit of their time, a spirit with which we find hard to be patient to-day, is undoubtedly true. But agains Robertson no such charge can be made. His naturally serious an sensitive nature, which gave him a morbid detestation for hi rôle as a popular preacher, and caused so much of his sho ministry at Brighton to be spent amidst tormenting illness, mad him altogether proof against the pleasant illusion that Englishme were on the borders of the Promised Land, and even then step ping happily across them. So in the year of the Great Exhibitio which seemed to so many to be a sign that benevolence and sel interest had somehow met together, that peace and materia prosperity had not only kissed each other but become joined i

[5] In some respects Robertson and Maurice invite a close comparison or with the other. Both were primarily preachers; and the churches of whic Maurice was successively Incumbent—St. Peter's, Vere St., in London, an St. Edward's in Cambridge—were not altogether dissimilar from Robertson proprietary chapel in Brighton. But Maurice, of course, was not *only* preacher, and throughout his life he was a public figure, enjoying wide friend ships, and exerting a strong influence over contemporary movements o thought. In these ways his life stands in contrast to the obscurity in whic Robertson's ministry was fulfilled.

n indissoluble union, Robertson foresaw the shivering of the ystem of personal interest 'by convulsions more terrible and nore bloody than the world has yet seen.'

> 'While men are talking of peace, and of the great progress of civilization, there is heard in the distance the noise of armies gathering rank on rank; east and west, north and south, are rolling towards us the crushing thunders of universal war.'[6]

Nor in any way did he search for an equation that would make ne best in humanism and in Christianity identical one with the ther. Thus in a sermon which supported the proposal to open ne Crystal Palace on Sundays, Robertson none the less warned is hearers:

> 'Christianity will humanize: we are not so sure that humanizing will Christianize. Let us be clear upon this matter. Esthetics are not religion. It is one thing to civilize and polish: it is another thing to christianize.'

And yet, strong in the belief that there was 'good in everyning,' Robertson was as far from the thought of man's total epravity to which our modern anti-liberals often seem to pproach so closely, as he was from approving a secularist creed o which no more than a veneer of Christian faith was added. He voided both because he found in Christ 'the meeting point of ne Divine and the human.' Therefore he could believe in a Divine Humanity' which 'elevates the soul.'

> 'You must have observed,' he says, 'the hopefulness of the character of Jesus—His hopefulness for human nature. (Yet) if ever there were one who might have despaired, it was He . . . Now it is this hopefulness that raises hope in us. Christian brethren, we dare to hope for that human nature which Jesus loved, we dare to forgive that nature which Jesus condescended to wear. This frail, evil, weak Humanity of ours, these hearts which yield to almost every gust of temptation, the Son of Man hoped for them.'[7]

nd again,

> 'We think of God as a Spirit, infinitely removed from and unlike the creatures He has made. But the truth is, man resembles God:—all spirits, all minds are of the same family. The Father bears a likeness to the Son whom He has created. The mind of God is similar to the mind of man. Love does not mean one thing in man, and another thing in God . . . The present manhood of Christ conveys this deeply important truth, that the Divine Heart is human in its sympathies.'[8]

r again,

> 'The world is but manifested Deity. That which lies beneath the surface of all Appearance, the cause of all Manifestation, is God. So that

[6] Sermon on 'The Christian Church a family.'
[7] Sermon on 'The sinlessness of Christ.'
[8] Sermon on 'The sympathy of Christ.'

> to forbid the love of all this world, is to forbid the love of that by which God is made known to us. The sounds and sights of this lovely world are but the drapery of the robe in which the Invisible has clothed Himself.'

How far removed is this from the dreary Gospel of Karl Barth and the doctors of these latter days! But Robertson does not forget that there is another side to the picture:

> 'The world,' he continues, 'is the glass through which we see the Maker. But what men do is this: They put the dull quicksilver of their own selfishness behind the glass, and so it becomes not the transparent medium through which God shines, but the dead opaque which reflects back ourselves.'[9]

In fact, altogether, this young Brighton preacher who died just a century ago can perhaps commend a liberal interpretation of Christianity to our generation more effectively than any of his contemporaries and immediate successors. Critical alike of ecclesiastical obscurantism and of too facile hopes for secular progress, steadily refusing to be driven to either extreme in reaction from the other, Robertson ought surely to be of special interest to-day when so many find it hard to keep their balance. Despite the imperfect medium through which his teaching has survived, through *ad hoc* discourses, some of them fragmentary, few of them coming directly from their author's pen, and all lacking the benefit of his revision, there yet emerges from them clearly enough an integrated faith which found in the Incarnation —in the Divine Humanity—both its coherence and its cogency. A careful perusal of Robertson's sermons will show that they are charged with significance for us to-day no less than for the people of Brighton to whom they were addressed a hundred years ago.

[9] Sermon on 'Worldliness.'

EXISTENTIALISM BROUGHT UP TO DATE

By The Rev. Canon Roland Bailey

EXISTENTIALISM has developed in a Continental atmosphere which is very different from our own. Partly for this reason it has been difficult to grasp, and frequently misunderstood. There have also been remarkably few reliable studies of the subject in English. This adds to the importance and interest of Dr. Heinemann's book, *Existentialism and the Modern Predicament*.[1] He was formerly Professor of Philosophy at Frankfurt University, and has a first-hand knowledge of the growth of the movement, of the leading exponents, and of the background of thought and outlook, which makes him an obvious authority on the subject.

For Dr. Heinemann, existentialism is no mere ephemeral fashion, but 'one of the essential forms of West European philosophy in an age of European collapse.' It is specifically an attempt to answer a crucial and urgent problem which both Hegel and Marx attempted to solve without success, namely, how can man overcome his estrangement and alienation from God, nature, other man, and himself. Two tests are used: (1) what is alive and what is dead in existentialism? and (2) are the existentialists the spiritual leaders of our time? The leading exponents, Kierkegaard, Husserl, Jaspers, Heidegger, Sartre, Marcel, and Berdyaev, are considered in successive chapters, and the conclusion is reached that they also have failed to solve the problem of alienation:

> 'Existentialism points here to an urgent problem, or rather to a set of problems, but offers no solution, partly because the problems are so complex and many sided that no simple solution is possible, and partly because they are to a certain extent, in principle insoluble.'

In other words, the existentialists are not the spiritual leaders of our time, and existentialism as such is dead, but its exponents continue to exert a powerful influence, and deal with the essential problems which other philosophers ignore. Many of their ideas are alive, while the existential approach is both valid and necessary.

> 'What then is existentialism? This is the point at which we have to change the form of the question. Instead of asking, "What is the essence of existentialism?" we now ask, "What is its function in present circumstances?"'

[1] *Existentialism and the Modern Predicament*, by F. H. Heinemann (Adam and Charles Black, London, 1953; 18/-)

> Its first function is to bring about a revaluation of problems and to liberate us from certain traditional problems whether they are material or partly formal and technical. The existentialists maintain that the philosophers of the past overlooked the most pressing problems of man and of human existence. What is the good, they would say, of talking about a transcendent realm of values, if they are not realized here and now in human persons? What alone matters are problems that are lived, directly experienced, suffered and intimately connected with our being; problems in which we are engaged, which form part of ourselves which we cannot escape.'

In conclusion, Dr. Heinemann outlines a new approach based on the concept of response: '*Respondeo, ergo sum.*'

The first question is whether it is sufficient to interpret existentialism as an attempt to deal with the problem of alienation. Dr. Heinemann considers this concept at some length and in a most interesting way, but it seems equally true to say that it aims at the elucidation of existence. Moreover, could not the existential position be indicated by a group of principles, covering, for instance, the nature of man, freedom and the authentic life, truth and reason, essence and existence?

The interpretation of the leading exponents is both lucid and penetrating. A better understanding of the modern movement is provided by the inclusion of Husserl, although he does not belong to it, but it is unusual to include Berdyaev, the criticism of whom seems to take insufficient account of his assertions that 'Community life is the effective realization of the fullness of the free life of personalities' and that 'clarifying grace is indeed the highest freedom.' The desire of Marcel and Jaspers to be known in future as a neo-Socratic and as a philosopher of reason respectively is probably not so significant as the author would suggest. Professor Karl Jaspers seems clearly the most important and representative exponent. Dr. Heinemann gives him first place among the philosophers of existence, but concludes that his attempt to formulate a system has failed, that he has returned to a philosophy of reason, and that he is in fact a 'gliding philosopher' who does not commit himself. Can such criticism be really justified? Dr. Allen thinks that Jaspers has brilliantly succeeded in making a system; the return to reason appears to be only a matter of emphasis; while Jaspers himself rejects the third criticism with some justification.

A notable result of Dr. Heinemann's treatment is that the popular identification of existentialism with Sartre is destroyed:

> 'Sartre's influence is enormous but devastating. He is doubtless a leading figure who has had an incredible hold on the younger generation in France . . . he does not reach the height of an intellectual leader. He does not believe in the spirit.'

Sartre inclines to nihilism, and, as Mounier points out, may in fact be described as a non-existentialist.

What does Dr. Heinemann mean when he states that 'existentialism as such is dead,' and when its 'impending fall' is announced? The answer is much less than this implies. He does not mean that its influence is waning, nor that its approach is to be rejected, but rather points out that we need existential philosophers, that much in existentialism is very much alive, that it continues to exert a great influence, that its approach is sound and that it deals with the right questions. He points out elsewhere that 'Existentialism still dominates the philosophical discussion in Western Germany.' But it offers no basis for logic, gives no satisfactory account of science, and affords no foundation for a theory of value. It is dead as an ontology, as a logic, and in so far as the attempts to systematize it have failed :

> 'Existentialism cannot be systematized : it is a principle of life which escapes all Procrustian systematization. This does not mean that existentialists are unable to construct philosophies of their own ; but if they do so, they are bound to transcend the principle of existence.'

Is Dr. Heinemann saying more than that philosophers who claim that philosophy cannot be systematized should not attempt to produce a system? It all depends on what is meant by a system, and presumably the existentialists would deny that they had attempted to produce one in the author's sense. But in any case, can it be concluded that in any profound sense existentialism is dead as such, or even about to fall? On the author's own showing, it is clearly very much alive.

What is then the outlook for existentialism? Perhaps the chief criticism of the movement is to regard it as an irrational outburst produced by the European crisis, a dangerous attack on reason which will vanish as soon as the crisis fades. But this is a superficial interpretation. This loss of its appeal as a fashionable vogue will be a distinct gain. Although it is a philosophy of crisis which has developed among nations which have suffered defeat, it has an historical basis which can be traced back to the pre-Socratic Greek thinkers as has been indicated by Dr. Casserley and others. Abroad, it continues to exert a powerful influence. Dr. Heinemann considers it as a reaction to positivism and logical analysis, and it is worth considering whether in some form it may not succeed the existing approach of British philosophy, which has had a long run. It deals with aspects which have been neglected, and in particular with fundamental contemporary problems on which philosophy is reasonably expected to offer some light.

The issues of reason and subjectivity are crucial for existentialism. Dr. Heinemann covers a wide field from an analysis of leadership to a study in negation, which means that he sometimes has to be content rather with labels than with exhaustive treatment, and this particularly applies to these two crucial aspects on which existentialism stands or falls to a large extent. A longer exposition of the place of reason and subjectivity in existentialism would have been valuable. The future of the movement as a philosophy depends on how far it can secure a rational basis, while there is much confusion about the principle of subjectivity, which is frequently misunderstood.

Although existentialism has an essentially religious character, the author regards the statement that it 'marks a return of the religious element into the world' as probably an overstatement, but 'it is true that the way of existentialism has led from religion through agnosticism and atheism back to religion.' All its exponents are concerned in some way with the question of God and his existence, and even Sartre is concerned to show the consequences of the loss of values which depend upon religion. Dr. Heinemann's own view is given in his concluding chapter :

> 'Man alone responds to God, speaks with God, and prays to God. This fact gives us the clue for understanding religion and the mystics, without forcing us to admit the claim of the mystics to experience ultimate reality. The hypothesis is that religion is based on a specific type of responsiveness of the spiritual centre of man to the Transcendent, *i.e.* to powers transcending the sphere of sense-experience. Religion is not based on a feeling of dependence (Schleiermacher), nor is it "the knowledge of the Absolute in a finite consciousness" (Hegel). It is based on a response to the Absolute which has the power of elevating man above the misery of earthly turmoil and of redeeming him. What matters is the manner in which we respond, not whether God answers or not.'

The chief influence of existentialism in this country has been through theology. The impact of Barth and Brunner is likely to be followed by that of Bultmann and Heim, and in this sense also the movement is alive.

Dr. Heinemann's book is certainly stimulating and thought-provoking. Lucid in style and at times provocative, as a scholarly examination of existentialism it is an authoritative work which deserves to be widely read and can be commended to those who wish to know what this philosophy is about, and are prepared to try and grapple with some real problems, and especially that of man's predicament. But the contention that existentialism is dead as such or about to collapse is only maintained in a limited sense which is apt to be misleading.

To-day it is exercising a widespread influence both in philosophy and theology, and stands to gain by ceasing to be regarded as a popular catch-word. It points beyond positivism in providing an approach and asking the urgent questions which Dr. Heinemann agrees are of crucial importance.

His conclusion is impressive :

> 'Living in complete insecurity under the constant menace of annihilation, we experience the unreliability of human institutions and the instability of all finite objects. In our despair we are inclined to doubt everything, even God's existence, of whom we cannot and shall not make an image. But at the height of our suffering, when everything seems to break down, suddenly we find ourselves confronted with an unconditional request which we have to answer. In such moments we experience God, and we learn that it is *we* who have to respond. We have to find *our* affirmation, which as a personal truth becomes objective if in very fact it be the right answer to the transcendent call in this specific situation. It is *we* who have to do those actions without which the eternal Light cannot conquer the forces of darkness.'

FLYING SAUCERS; FICTION AND FACTS

By Martin Davidson, D.Sc., F.R.A.S.

AN immense interest exists in America in the flying-saucer cult, and in some other countries—including our own—bands of enthusiasts abound who look out for these objects and, according to their own reports, frequently see them. This myth-creating mentality is reflected in *Flying Saucers Have Landed*,[1] by Desmond Leslie and George Adamski.

About three-fourths of the work is due to Mr. Leslie, who produces excerpts from a number of publications going back to A.D. 1290 which record various phenomena in the atmosphere showing, according to the author, that flying-saucers are by no means merely recent arrivals from other planets. Twenty-five pages in Chapter 2 are devoted to descriptions of phenomena which most readers will probably recognise as due to meteors, the brighter ones frequently leaving trails visible for some time, fire-balls, noctilucent clouds, aurorae, parhelia, and possibly even meteorological balloons. Not content with a record of these 'visitors' for nearly seven hundred years, Mr. Leslie proceeds to explain how they arrive so silently and are supported in apparent defiance of the Earth's pull. Chapter 6, 'Flying Saucers and Sound,' is devoted to this.

In this chapter numerous quotations from various works dealing with the occult are given, and reference is made to a weekly magazine (the name is not given) issued in 1951 in America, which reproduced photographs showing tables, chairs and furniture flying in the air and careering round a fully lighted room. He explains these phenomena by 'that little known force called the Human Will,' and there follows a description of the electric currents emitted by the human brain—well-known, it seems, to the Sanskrit and other writers who believed that the brain current 'is very, very powerful.' If the current itself is not responsible at least it can induce in surrounding objects a current sufficiently powerful to raise huge rocks in the air. Here we have the explanation of the moving and assembling of the massive stones for building the Great Pyramid in Egypt 'tens of thousands of years ago' (Egyptologists will be interested in all this). He produces

[1] *Flying Saucers Have Landed*, by Desmond Leslie and George Adamski (Werner Laurie, London, 1953, with 12 photographs and 2 line drawings, 12/6 net).

evidence from a biography of St. Teresa of Avila that she sometimes levitated and on one occasion, from a point near the ceiling, was overheard chiding the Almighty for making a spectacle of her, and this is seriously quoted to show that 'she had hit off the "wave-length" that causes opposite forces to the Earth's *magnetism* (*sic*) to come into play.' Additional support to this theory is provided by the case of St. Joseph of Copertino, the seventeenth century Italian monk, 'who could not only leviate (*sic*) at will, but sometimes also carried passengers and freight into the bargain.'

These and similar cases provide sufficient evidence for Mr. Leslie to formulate his theory of the functioning of flying-saucers. A highly developed being in his space vehicle utters 'the correct vibration which will make the propelling forces obey and thrust him through the void towards our atmosphere.' Although a difficulty arises when he enters our ocean of air, yet the intelligent being who perfectly understands its nature, utters a second vibration that smooths out and completely neutralises 'all the jagged rending disharmony of a solid body being thrust through by sheer brute force.' It seems, however, that he does not use brute force, because, understanding the hidden properties of air, he uses gentle, harmonious forces that overcome all difficulties.

Chapter 7, 'The Vimanas,' gives an account, culled from Scott Elliott's *The Story of Atlantis*, published nearly sixty years ago, of the air boats (the vimanas), built of either metal or wood, their outside shining in the the dark as if coated with luminous paint. Their motive power was supplied by the personal 'vril,' that is, the raising of the personal vibrations sufficiently to overcome the Earth's 'magnetic' attraction. (Mr. Leslie apparently believes that it is the Earth's magnetism which makes unsupported bodies fall towards it.) The next five chapters deal with 'Flying Saucers Before the Flood,' 'Saucers in Sanskirt,' 'Saucers for a Song,' 'Saucers in Atlantis,' and 'Are Vimanas Flying Saucers?' The first of these gives some excerpts from the *Samarangana Sutradhara* which inform us that by means of the machines described human beings can fly in the air and even heavenly beings can come to the Earth, the inference being that ancient people were accustomed to receiving men from other planets, just as happens to-day.

It may not be out of place to remark that the author's equipment for dealing with scientific problems is seriously defective. A few examples of this are taken from Chapters 13 and 20, but, of course, it is impossible to refer to all the errors. On page 119 he speaks about moons spinning round planets, planets rotating round suns, suns rolling round galaxies, obviously ignorant of

the difference—a most important difference in dynamical astronomy—between rotation and revolution. On page 120 we are informed that the Earth is rushing through space at many thousands of miles per second—a gross exaggeration. The Earth's orbital speed round the Sun is 18½ miles a second, and if he means—as he may, but it is all very vague—the speed of the Sun round the centre of our Galaxy, this is less than 200 miles per second. In addition, speed 'through space' is utterly meaningless; speed can only be expressed relative to some other body or bodies. On page 164 he informs us that the Earth is surrounded by a sea of 'nitrogen, oxygen and hydrogen dioxide.' No doubt he meant water or aqueous vapour in the last case, of which our atmosphere contains about 1.4 per cent. by volume, but water is not hydrogen dioxide (generally known as hydrogen peroxide) of which our atmosphere contains only the most minute traces: it is hydrogen monoxide, as its chemical formula implies. But sufficient has been said about the first portion of the book and we shall now examine the second part by George Adamski.

On page 171 Mr. Adamski informs us that he is a 'philosopher, student, teacher, saucer researcher.' His home is Palomar Gardens, eleven miles from the Hale Observatory where the giant 200-inch telescope is doing very valuable work, but Mr. Adamski takes care to correct 'a widespread error' that he is associated with the staff of the Observatory (we should hardly think that anyone who reads his contribution to the book would suspect such an association.) His interest in flying saucers seems to be well-known in certain parts of America and much of his spare time is spent in looking out for these objects. He works at a café the owner of which, Mrs. Alice K. Wells, plays an important part in the story of his interview with an inhabitant of Venus with whom he had an hour's conversation on November 20, 1952.

Accompanied by six friends whose names are given and include Dr. and Mrs. George H. Williamson, of Prescott, Arizona, and Mrs. Wells, previously mentioned, they made a trip in two cars to Desert Centre from which they turned down the Parker Highway, leading to Parker, Arizona. They appear to have been guided in their course by Adamski, who tells us that he has the habit of following his feelings or 'hunches,' and to make a long story short, he sent all the party back from where he had decided to investigate a space ship that appeared, to a spot which was something between half a mile and a mile from from him. He told them that they were to wait there an hour unless he signalled to them before that time, and when the Venusian

ppeared soon afterwards from his saucer, which belonged to the pace ship, Adamski advanced about a quarter of a mile to interiew him, which implies that, on his own reckoning, he was at east three-quarters of a mile and possibly a mile and a quarter rom his six friends. A long conversation lasting exactly an hour ook place between the Venusian and Adamski, but it seems uperfluous to deal with this 'conversation' which was carried on y means of signs and telepathy. The Venusian is described very ully—about five feet six inches high, weighing about 135 pounds, ge probably twenty-eight years, and most beautiful in appearnce, his hair, sandy in colour, hanging in beautiful waves to his houlder. Even details like his high forehead, large but calm rey-green eyes, slightly aslant at the outer corner, finely chiselled ose, and many others are fully described, but most unfortunately e objected to Adamski taking his photograph. However, Mrs. Vells, who was watching the interview from a distance of about a ile with her binoculars, drew a sketch of him which is reproduced n page 209. It is most important to notice that the details could ot have been filled in from Adamski's description because he dmits in the caption that the sketch 'conveys the broad features f his appearance but is far short of doing him justice.' It is lear, therefore, that Mrs. Wells who, we are informed, is artistic, as entirely responsible for the sketch. Something on this matter ill be added in a note at the end of the review, but in the meanme it may be said that before the Venusian entered his saucer join his space-ship, Adamski gave him one of the negatives of ie saucer which he had photographed before the interview, and ie Venusian made him understand that he would return it. On ecember 13 he kept his promise and dropped it out of his saucer ear Adamski's home; although the holder was dented by falling a rock the plate was intact and on examining it later it was en that the print showed a symbolic message, the original photoraph having been washed off. The symbolic message had not een deciphered at the time of the publication of the book lthough 'several scientists are working on it.' They are also ying to decipher the markings of the footprints of the Venusian, sts of which were taken by Dr. Williamson, who always took packet of plaster of Paris with him when he went on a trip, eing an anthropologist.' It is not stated what footmarks Dr. Villiamson hoped to find near Parker, but possibly he had *homo anderthalensis* in mind.

Adamski's six friends swore affidavits, copies of which are produced on Plate 13, saying that they had witnessed the meeting with the man in the space ship, but no affidavit appears to

have been sworn by Adamski himself. The form of the affidavits is as follows :

> ' I, the undersigned, do solemnly state that I have read the account of the personal contact between George Adamski and a man from another world, brought here in his Flying Saucer—' Scout ' ship. And that I was a party to, and witness to the event as herein recounted.'

No one doubts that the party, about a mile away from the scene of the ' personal contact,' saw Adamski and another man—it makes little difference who he was—by using their binoculars. The affidavits do not seem to be very helpful to sceptics, some of whom have suggested hallucination as an explanation ; the reviewer has another explanation which, however, he prefers not to divulge at present.

Readers will probably welcome, after this grotesque story, a few scientific explanations of the ' flying saucers.' Some have been suggested at the beginning of this review, but there are others, and reference should here be made to the excellent book *Flying Saucers* (Putnam, 21/- net), by Donald H. Menzel Professor of Astrophysics, Harvard College Observatory, which deals very fully with the subject. A short explanation also appeared in the *Journal of the Optical Society of America*, xliii, 4, April 1953, by Urner Liddel, under the title, ' Phantasmagoria or Unusual Observations in the Atmosphere.' Various other publications deal with the subject but it is sufficient to refer to the above two.

Menzel gives a large number of cases in which parhelia or mock suns, reflection or refraction of light rays in the atmosphere by mist, rain-drops, ice crystals, etc., fireballs, and even *practical jokers* (is there no legal machinery for drastic action against the latter?) are the explanations of the saucers. Other explanations are mentioned and in certain respects these are more elusive than those already referred to. One of these is due to temperature inversion in the upper regions of the atmosphere, on which a few words will be said.

At a height of less than two miles there is a rise in the temperature of the air so that in consequence strata of cold and warm air are sandwiched, which give rise to peculiar optical effects. A moderately good reflecting surface is thus provided and it is possible that even ground lights may be reflected, giving the impression that there are ' saucers ' high up in the atmosphere if, as often happens, there is some wave motion in the boundary layers, this gives the impression to observers on the ground that the ' saucers ' are moving. If airmen attempt to intercept them

they will find, when they penetrate the strata where there is inversion, that the objects have vanished. A scare occurred in the summer of 1952 when an armada of saucers was reported to be flying over Washington, and, equally important with the visual observations, they were recorded by radar. A radio broadcast assured the 'people in the saucers' that the Americans were friendly to them and even indicated an air field where they could land. It was afterwards shown that this armada was due to inversion, and even the radar was misleading; it is well known that radar waves can be bent during abnormal atmospheric conditions and give echoes from places a long way beyond the visible horizon.

An account is given of the scare in the middle of 1947, about the time when the saucers first appeared, when a civilian was flying close to a high mountain in America, and saw a chain of saucer-looking objects swerving about in the high peaks. Their surfaces were so polished that they reflected the sun's light almost like a mirror, and after this many more were seen by others. Although not all the latter were due to the same cause, many being meteorological balloons, Prof. Menzel gives an explanation of the first objects mentioned above, which he does not think were hallucinations. Most people who have done mountain climbing know that there is frequently a violent air circulation near the peaks, and if clouds of snow are in the vicinity they will reflect the sun's light, the swirling motion giving the impression of saucer-like objects. Even a layer of haze or fog near the peaks would produce the same effect, provided there was sufficiently violent air circulation.

Reliable information from airmen about glowing balls of light that persisted in accompanying them during their flights but which they could never intercept in spite of vigorous efforts to do so, has been frequently supplied, and is explained by Menzel as due to light reflected from a distant source by a whirlpool of air over a wing of the aircraft.

It is obvious, from these explanations, that there are many ways in which 'flying saucers' can be produced, and we shall conclude by mentioning only one more case.

In July, 1948, Eastern Airline pilots were flying a DC-3 over Georgia at 3 a.m., when they saw a wingless aircraft about 100 feet long, with lighted windows. Although they veered course it followed them and then disappeared in clouds above them. The explanation is as follows.

Moonlight was reflected from the aluminium of the plane and even more so from the plastic windows, and sufficient illumination was thus provided to give a source for reflection from adjacent incipient clouds. Of course the eyes of the pilot were dark-adapted,

for which reason the reflection appeared brilliant. The fact that it was a side reflection explained why the aircraft appeared wingless.

No doubt readers have seen other explanations for the phenomena—for instance, the well authenticated case of a pilot who chased the planet Venus—and possibly equally ludicrous stories, but sufficient has been said to discredit all theories of the 'flying saucers' emanating from some hostile nation and *a fortiori* of their arrival from some other planet.

NOTE ON THE SKETCH OF THE VENUSIAN ON PAGE 209

This sketch was made by Mrs. Alice Wells, one of the party that accompanied Mr. Adamski, and from the account of the movements of this party, and of Adamski, given on page 192 and also on page 194, she must have been about a mile from the Venusian and possibly more. It is clear from the caption under the sketch that this was made by Mrs. Wells 'while watching the interview through binoculars.' This is emphasised by Adamski who obviously did not supply any details because he informs us that 'It conveys the broad features of his appearance but is far short of doing him justice.' The surprising thing is that Mrs. Wells produced a sketch which so carefully corresponds with the description Adamski gave of the Venusian on pages 195-7. In this connection the following facts may be useful.

The human eye cannot, generally speaking, define an object which subtends an angle less than one minute of arc at the eye. For instance, a white sphere placed against a dark background 100 yards distant, would subtend an angle of about a minute where the observer is, but it would appear only as an extremely small speck or would not be seen at all. The eye is oblong and while more than an inch in width with some people it is much less in depth, but can be taken as approximately an inch in diameter and could not be easily discerned at a distance of 100 yards. If viewed through binoculars a mile away it would be necessary for them to magnify about seventeen times just to see the eye as a tiny speck and if a magnification of fifty were used (not a very usual thing with binoculars) it would be equivalent to looking at an object with the naked eye more than 30 yards away. At this distance the eye would look like a spot about the hundredth of an inch in diameter at a distance of 10 inches. Obviously Mrs. Wells could not have seen the Venusian's eyes better than this—and probably no as good—yet the details are shown, even the eyes 'slightly aslant at the outer corners.' In addition, the 'finely chiselled nose,' the 'beautiful white teeth,' and various other details given by Adamski are faithfully reproduced. It would be very interesting if Mrs. Wells published an account of how these details were seen about a mile away with binoculars. No allowance has been made in these calculations for the effect of light absorption by the atmosphere, which could be considerable at a distance of a mile and render observation much more difficult.

A CHINESE CRITIC ON PROTO-LUKE

y the Rev. Robert Leaney, M.A., B.D., Chaplain of Ripon Hall, Oxford

THE Proto-Luke theory, in the sense in which it was advocated by Streeter, has received attention from an interesting quarter nd has been made the basis of some unusual views; these are ot perhaps likely to carry conviction altogether but are certainly orth considering for their intriguing character. The author of ese 'brief notes' is the Rev. Roland Koh, a parish priest in the iocese of Hong-Kong, and he calls them *The Writings of t. Luke*.[1] Mr. Koh begins with a defence of the accuracy of *uke* in iii, 1-2, arguing that the addition of the less noteworthy ilers is due to Luke's desire to bring home to local inhabitants e date according to their own way of reckoning. This may prove fruitful method of approach but would suggest rather that Luke xpected his gospel to be circulated in those areas whose ruler is entioned rather than that it necessarily derived its sources thence; ere we shall disagree with Mr. Koh that *Luke* iii, 1-2 is the reface of a document, whether of Proto-Luke or of 'the tradition f the life and work of John, son of Zacharias.' It is perhaps etter to say that Luke knew that the Lord was well-known to the eople of the Decapolis, a fact rightly pointed out by our author, ho is also right in arguing that these cities are not restricted to e actual region called Decapolis (a fact to which the wording of *lark* vii, 31 bears witness), and in pointing out the significance of eighbouring Damascus as an early stronghold of Christianity.

The second chapter contains Mr. Koh's most arresting sug-estion, which is that *Acts* was composed before the Third ospel: the 'former treatise' of *Acts* i, 1, was Proto-Luke, the rder of writing being Proto-Luke, *Acts*, Third Gospel. The gument is for the most part familiar enough; in *Acts* there is no clusion to any event after 58-60 while *Luke* xxi points to a know-dge of the events of 70, the gospel does not begin with 'all at Jesus began to do and to teach,' but with the Infancy Narra-ves of the first two chapters, whereas Proto-Luke does begin th the acts and teaching of Jesus. But Mr. Koh has an interesting terpretation of the prologue of the gospel; the gospel indeed races all things accurately from the first,' but this is a sort of ology for the 'former treatise,' Proto-Luke, which, as Mr. Koh

[1] With the subtitle, 'Brief Notes on the Material Peculiar to the Lukan ritings and on the Possibility that *Acts* was Composed before the Third ospel.' There is a foreword by the Bishop of Hong-Kong.

charmingly puts it, 'had no first.' The gospel has put right wha Luke had been chided for omitting. Indeed, the 'many' wh 'have taken in hand to draw up a narrative' included *Mark* an the publication of this and similar works forced Luke to compos his complete gospel to meet the criticisms of readers who had rea in *Mark* or elsewhere information which Luke had omitted i Proto-Luke.

Attractive though the theory may seem at first sight it is no difficult to attack it at once: Mr. Koh himself agrees with Streete rather than with Vincent Taylor in his estimate of the source o *Luke* xxi, which he rightly regards as Markan. Thus it is th complete gospel and not Proto-Luke which bears signs of know ledge of the events of 70. So far, so good, although it should b noted that a 'gospel' (which is what Streeter also would hav called 'Proto-Luke') might have been expected to contain Little Apocalypse; but what are we to make of the Infancy Narra tives? These are no part of Proto-Luke according to any theor so far published,[2] but their addition to the gospel cannot be sai to be due to the criticisms of those who had read *Mark*, though might be possible to argue that the group of sayings and incident which Streeter called 'L' was known to those critics who wishe Luke to write a more complete gospel. According to Mr. Koh these would be the people of the Decapolis, but the argument which he gives for this view in the chapter which he devotes t 'L' are unconvincing, his list of the material being far too ur critical, including several passages which are almost certainly du to Luke himself, *e.g.* xxiii, 40-43, and two which are probably com posite, *viz*, iv, 16-30, and v, 1-11.

It would be absurd to argue at length against a book claimin to be no more than notes, but the main theory advanced is suf ficiently important to demand some consideration, and this theory that *Acts* was composed before the final and complete edition o the gospel, clearly rests upon Streeter's Proto-Luke, one objectio to which has already been mentioned, that it suggests a gosp which lacked the Little Apocalypse. A much more importan objection is concerned with the Passion Narrative.

For the Proto-Luke theory much depends upon this ver important part of any gospel: in the Passion Narrative of *Luk* xxii, 1-13, is conceded by both Streeter and Taylor as Markan and this very passage reveals Luke's considerable freedom wit his sources: for example, verse 6 makes quite clear that to betra

[2] That is, if the term Proto-Luke is used in Streeter's sense and not that, for example, of Sahlin in *Der messias und das Gottesvolk*.

esus 'conveniently' (*Mark* xiv, 11) meant to do so 'in the absence f the multitude' (*Luke* xxii, 6). Luke's omission of *Mark* xiv, -9, is readily intelligible in view of *Luke* vii, 36-50, but another notive is provided by the consequent juxtaposition of the decision f Judas to betray the Lord to the perplexity of the priests as to ow to arrest him, which is hinted in verse. 2. Thus the narrative ecomes more ordered and continuous. Again, verse 8 names the isciples who are to prepare the Passover and makes the initiative or the preparation that of Jesus' command, instead of the disples' question (*Mark* xiv, 12). Finally, verses 7, 8, 13, 15 make erfectly clear that for Luke the Last Supper was a Passover eal. In the remainder of the Passion Narrative together with e narratives of the Resurrection (xxii, 14 to the end of the ospel), while Luke manifestly had another authority for certain assages without parallel in *Mark*, *viz.* xxii, 36-38, and xxiv, -end, others, *e.g.* xxiii, 6-16, xxiii, 27-31, may well be due to uke himself; and in the actual Passion Narrative (xxii, 1-xxiii,) the amount of material which cannot readily be explained as ue to the author's manipulation of *Mark* or to his own composion is extremely slight. Even if xxiii, 6-16, xxiii, 27-31, are aimed for a separate source, the material does not amount to a assion Narrative.

We may, therefore, argue that the supposed primitive gospel, Proto-Luke,' lacked the essential feature of a Passion Narrative, thout which its advocates would not recognize is as a gospel, d this very absence is urged on the basis of the most important ature of Luke's gospel from a critical point of view, the free d forthright treatment which Luke meets out to Mark elsewhere an in the Passion Narrative.

It is part of the Proto-Luke theory that *Luke* i-ii were added ter the composition of *Luke* iii, 1-xxiv, 53.[3] Taylor's arguments e: first that the sixfold date of iii, 1-2, suggests the opening of work. An alternative explanation is feasible, namely that Luke s here elaborating his 'Septuagintal' style, and possible models ght be quoted in, for example, II *Kings* xi, 21; xiii, 1, etc., ich, occurring in the midst of a narrative, are relevant examples re. But Mr. Koh has provided us with another possible explanan, which has already been mentioned. Taylor's second gument is that the Birth and Infancy sections exhibit a unity d homogeneity of their own, and do not harmonize altogether h the rest of the gospel. There is not space to argue this matter re, but it is far from certain that the first two chapters have a

[3] Taylor, *Behind the Third Gospel*, pp. 164-6.

unity other than that superimposed upon the material by Luke. We may mention briefly the possibility of two independent and indeed contradictory traditions which Luke has harmonized, one consisting of ii, 1-20, 22-38; i, 68-79; ii, 39-40, and possibly ii, 41-52. This earlier tradition knew nothing of the virginal conception, and in it the parents of Jesus are Joseph and Mary, who experience as much surprise at the evidence of the wonderful nature of their child as do all the other witnesses. ii, 21, shows signs of being an interpolation into this tradition and probably originally belonged to the other and later, comprising i, 5-45, 57-66, 80, 56; ii, 21; i, 46-55. Such a theory can be argued at much greater length, and with it may be urged that the earlier of the two traditions thus suggested has affinities with other passages in the gospel. One obvious example is that part of the genealogy (iii, 23b-34; as far as Abraham) which Luke apparently found in a source. The famous 'as was supposed' (iii, 23) may be simply regarded as one among many of Luke's accommodations of one tradition to the other. This earlier tradition is distinguished by its strong Jewish background, in which the Messianic expectation of deliverance from enemies is extremely earnest; accordingly it may be that we should assign to it such passages as the story of Zacchaeus with its unexpected emphasis on salvation having come to his house 'forasmuch as he also is a son of Abraham.'

Much of Mr. Koh's little book would be dismissed as irrelevant in the present climate of gospel criticism, as when he discusses the route of the last journey to Jerusalem; but he is far from unaware that many critics would regard it as irrelevant, and he is entitled to argue that 'it is fallacious to assume that all the eye-witnesses were dead and gone when the Gospel tradition took shape,' and to ask 'if the Christian faith created the Gospel record, what and who created Christian faith?' While we cannot follow him in his interesting theory based upon Streeter's Proto-Luke, it is heartening to find a busy parish priest not only reading widely and putting forward theories worth consideration, but—what is perhaps the most important thing at the present time—asking the right questions of theologians. For certainly, if they do not accept Mr. Koh's answers, they cannot ignore his questions.

[4] There are three misprints of some importance: p. 42, last line but one read 'Jews' for 'Jesus'; p. 47, line 2, 'Tyre' for Type'; p. 49, the word 'than' is required at the end of line 24.

JOHN SHARP : ARCHBISHOP OF YORK (1691-1714)

BIOGRAPHY is the most popular method of teaching history and when practised by a competent and conscientious historian can be the most educational. Such an educational biography has been produced by Dr. Tindal Hart. It is the Life of John Sharp, the good Archbishop of York[1], who must be distinguished from his contemporary James Sharp, the bad Archbishop of St. Andrews.

John Sharp, a son of Yorkshire, member of a wealthy Bradford family, graduate of Christ's College, Cambridge, Vicar of St. Giles', London, for some years Dean of Norwich, and ultimately for twenty-two years Archbishop of York, vividly illustrates in his life (1644—1714) what Augustine Birrell called 'the troublesome history of the Church of England.' Born when the forces of Charles I (King and Martyr) were being broken by the 'great execution' done upon them at Marston Moor by a combined army of Puritans and Presbyterians under the leadership of Fairfax and Oliver Cromwell and completed in the succeeding year at Naseby, John Sharp went up from his Yorkshire Grammar School to become a member of Christ's College, Cambridge, at that time the centre of Christian Platonism, in the early years of Charles II when Popish plots, real or alleged, were the terror of the underworld of English Protestantism. *O tempora O mores!*

Sharp became a tutor in the Heneage family whose head, ultimately Lord Chancellor and Earl of Nottingham, was a devoted member of the Church of England. It is to this connection that Sharp largely owed his future ecclesiastical promotion. He was ordained in 1667 by a faculty which enabled him to obtain Deacon's and Priest's Orders together *extra tempora.*

Sharp was a sound scholar but not *doctissimus*, an effective teacher, but not a Jeremy Taylor, a devoted parochial pastor worthy to rank with Richard Baxter. When Dutch William, a whole-hearted Presbyterian Calvinist, became regal patron of the Church of England, Sharp's name was submitted to him as suitable for promotion associated among others with the names of Tillotson, Tenison and Wake, all three of whom were appointed successively Archbishops of Canterbury and were distinguished broad Churchmen or Latitudinarians as they were called at that

[1] *The Life and Times of John Sharp, Archbishop of York,* by A. Tindal Hart, D.D. (S.P.C.K., 1949; 21/-).

time. Sharp however was not a Latitudinarian. At heart he was a very loyal High Churchman, but also tolerant towards churchmen of other types. He revered the most notable of the Non-Jurors and would gladly have promoted them had it been at all possible: but it was not possible. Although a friend of Tillotson and Tenison, he did not support their schemes for the comprehension of the Protestant Dissenters in the English Church. He was no supporter of the Dissenters as he feared that they would only use their increasing freedom and influence to weaken the National Church.

Sharp was very much afraid of Roman Catholicism, but his attitude in the days when James II ruled was characteristic of his churchmanship. He preached publicly against the superstitions and errors of Papalism, but maintained that James II ought, as their lawful King, to receive the honour and loyalty of his subjects in spite of his Romanism.

Dr. Tindal Hart describes Sharp as 'a practical Churchman' and this is the soundest description of him as an ecclesiastic. An example of Sharp's *practical* episcopal policy appears in his attitude towards baptism by the laity. When pamphlets were being circulated by certain Anglican 'High-fliers' in the latter part of Queen Anne's reign 'proclaiming that only those who were baptized by episcopally ordained clergy' were admitted to a state of salvation, Archbishop Tenison wished to issue an authoritative statement affirming the validity of Baptism by laymen provided that water and the Triune formula were used. Sharp, although he knew that lay Baptism was valid, refused to sign the proclamation on the ground that such a public declaration by the Church authorities would weaken the Church of England by promoting an increase of Baptisms by dissenting ministers to the prejudice of the ministry of the parish clergy.

Sharp loved the Church of England (*cf.* page 260) and sought in every way by his devoted service to promote its unity, authority and influence by judicious and tolerant means. He possessed a great Christian heart and most attractive manners. Constant reference is made to his 'condescension' and his accessibility and his generous readiness to minister to all who needed his help.

The story of his interview with Susannah Wesley, the mother of Charles and John is well known. Her clerical husband was in prison for debt and his wife with her large family to support appealed to the Archbishop for help.

> '"Tell me," says he, 'Mrs. Wesley, whether you ever really wanted bread?" "My Lord," said I, "I will freely own to your Grace that

> strictly speaking, I never did want bread. But then I have had so much care to get it before it was eat, and to pay for it after, as has often made it very unpleasant to me. And I think to have bread on such terms is the next degree of wretchedness to having none at all." "You are certainly in the right," replied my Lord . . .' (p. 302).

Much more remarkable is his dealing with the highwayman who on a Yorkshire moor demanded his money or his life. The *incognito* Archbishop replied to the highwayman:

> 'I am a very old man and my life is of very little consequence; yours seems far otherwise . . . tell me how much you want to make you independent of so dangerous and destructive a business as you are now engaged in.'

In response to the highwayman's confession of his deplorable situation, the Archbishop advanced him £50 which the ex-highwayman, eighteen months later, repaid with a wonderful letter of thanks. This letter is given in full by Dr. Tindal Hart on p. 298.

As we read this most educational biography we are forced to the conclusion that it was not the Archbishop's scholarship nor his eloquence, nor his ecclesiastical statesmanship, but his Christian character and his unsparing devotion to pastoral duties of every kind which rank him with Thomas Ken as the best beloved English Prelate in that difficult age for English Churchmen.

H. D. A. Major

BOOK REVIEWS

RIDLEY HALL, CAMBRIDGE

In 1941, Dr. Bullock gave us the first volume of this *History of Ridley Hall*,[1] and now in a second volume he brings the narrative up to date. In it he surveys the years 1908-51 with Tait, Gibson, and Allison as Principals; a period which of course also covers the two wars. An Introduction gives us a brief survey over this period of (1) The supply and training of Ordinands, (2) The provision in Cambridge for theological study, (3) Cambridge religious life in general and (4) the contribution made by Ridley men to Evangelical life and thought. In an appendix Dr. Bullock gathers together some statistics and other items of particular interest and information. Amongst these are notes of the various possessions of the Hall; of its heraldry, and of the athletic achievements of Ridley men. Incidentally *The English Churchman of* 1890 remarked that 'Ridley Hall has taken more than her share in the athletic life of the University. Muscular Christianity has been exemplified there' (p. 255). Dr. Bullock aptly reminds us that Bishop Ridley himself would 'very often . . . exercise himself . . . both with the bow and at hand ball' (p. 255), and also recalls the precept and practice of Charles Perry, Simeon, and Handley Moule in particular.

This is certainly a detailed work and while Dr. Bullock claims that the book is designed primarily for Ridleians' (p. xiii) we can be sure that many Cambridge men will find it of immense interest. Or again, everyone concerned with the training of the clergy can surely benefit from pondering this history

of a Theological College linked with a University, set within a specifically Evangelical tradition, enduring two wars, and still 'full and flourishing' (p. xiii).

Of special interest to readers of the *Modern Churchman* is perhaps the way in which, despite occasional strains, Ridley has managed nevertheless to bring and keep together the theological conservative and the more liberal minded. It is here especially that we can admire the way in which the author allows his records to 'speak for themselves' (p. xiii). We have for example, on page 10, the remark that 'The Cambridge Inter-Collegiate Christian Union (born in 1877) has remained strongly evangelistic, theologically exclusive and consequently not often willing to co-operate with others,' and this is followed by a note which embodies a personal reflection of Dr. Tait: 'The C.I.C.C.U. attitude began to harden in my days and I tried in vain to heal the breach between Fundamentalists and the Moderns. I attended a conference of the respective leaders held in Ridley but it came to nought; and I had to take steps to prevent Ridley from being identified with the C.I.C.C.U. attitude . . .' Yet I think that without doubt we may say that Ridley itself, and Dr. Tait as one of its most notable Principals, did what the conference itself failed to do —and in personal charity (yet honesty) any dangers of disruption were overcome. In this connection it is specially interesting to have the words of an old member of the Hall writing of the years 1913-14: 'One of the features of this period was the rising tide of controversy over "Fundamentalism". There were several students who clung to an extreme doctrine of verbal inspiration of the Scriptures, and one or two were reported to have refused to take the Theological Tripos lest their minds should be corrupted. I remember an occasion in Hall, when one of these was sitting next to me and being "drawn out" by another neighbour. To put an end to what seemed to me a rather futile argument, I said: "Well, —, come up to my room afterwards and let us talk it over properly." "No, I wouldn't do that." "Why not?" "That would be playing with the serpent." Tait and the Staff, however, were very wise and careful, and, while avoiding provocativeness, showed that they thought it necessary to apply to the Bible the canons of a reasoned and reverent historical and literary criticism. As a consequence, most men found their feet in due course.'

It is specially noteworthy in this connection to find it said of the fourth Principal (p. 211): 'Bit by bit, conservative critics were forced to admit that, however little they might share his views, he had an undeniably real experience of Christ,' though when he was appointed 'it was feared that the more conservative would be alienated and Ridley lose its distinctive connection with the C.I.C.C.U.' The former quotation occurred in *The Record* and the latter is a 'personal impression' of Dr. C. E. Raven, who continues a little later: 'the C.I.C.C.U. has stood loyally by the Hall and its members have been happy there.' At the same time it is equally important to remember that on the other side Dr. Raven can say, of the fourth Principal's period, 'I do not think that the Hall has ever turned out so large a number of First Class Honours men or shown keener concern with research.' It is surely a tremendous tribute to Ridley—its Principals, Staff and Students that differing viewpoints and approaches could come together in its fellowship in this way. It may well be true that Ridley, like all theological colleges, has probems ahead of far greater difficulty and complexity than any it has yet faced; problems of finance, staffing and management; problems of the supply of ordinands and of

[1] *The History of Ridley Hall, Cambridge*. Vol. II, by Dr. F. W. B. Bullock: with a Foreword by the Bishop of Ely. (Cambridge. Printed for the Council of Ridley Hall, at the University Press. 1953. Copies obtainable from the Principal, 26/-.) (1953.)

their training. But these two volumes tell of faith and faithfulness, scholarship and devotion; of men of vision and men of energy who in each generation secured the future. No doubt the contemporary climate in general has changed not unhelpfully; but the somewhat new emphasis of some remarks of the Rev. Paul Gibson, Principal of Ridley Hall from 1927—1945, is surely significant in itself (p. 229): 'We Evangelicals are the heirs of a great tradition and I believe that the future well-being of our Church will depend to no small extent upon the courage and faithfulness with which, in these critical days, we boldly proclaim our convictions to the whole Church and reinterpret, in terms which the present age can understand, those truths which we believe to be fundamental to the Gospel of the New Testament.' I. T. RAMSEY

WINCHESTER: SACRED AND SCHOLASTIC

This book[1] is written by an enthusiast who is passionately devoted to the city of Winchester—the first capital of England with its rich historical associations, its cathedral unsurpassed in this country for the beauty and grandeur of its design and the perfection of its setting, the huge stone reredos, the finest of its kind in any English cathedral. Then, of course, there is the school founded by William of Wykeham which has, for its size, produced more distinguished citizens than any other school in Britain. 'This same school has a private life, more so than any other school in Britain, and it is that which binds her old boys so strongly'—and so on. To enjoy this book it is necessary to approach it without any prejudice in favour of other cathedrals—Salisbury, Norwich or Durham—or any other public school. It is better perhaps not to be acquainted with them at all.

If the reader is carried away by the eloquence and lyrical joy of the author, as well he might be, seeing that he is not only an authority on the city but is obviously sincere in his admiration of it, then he will not be satisfied with the excellent thirty-three full page photographs of Winchester, but will decide to visit the city at the earliest opportunity, and even if he has been there before he will want to go again because he now realises how much he has missed in his previous visits.

The author reaches his apogee in the description of the College of St. Mary —Winchester College—where he gives us the history of the school and its achievements in various fields in most glowing terms. He has to use the superlative most of the time, for he obviously thinks and feels that is the only way he can do justice to his theme.

The character of the founder, William of Wykeham, is an enigma. He was clearly a man with a fertile imagination and of the highest ideals, as he proved by the high standards he demanded and obtained for the school in Winchester, for New College in Oxford, and as expressed in the vaulted nave of Winchester Cathedral. Yet the money which he needed for these splendid creations was obtained to a certain extent by the most sordid means, the exploitation of women in the brothels on the south side of the Thames in London. He had not had unfortunately the benefit of being educated in the school he had established, where the emphasis is on the building up of character. His aim was to ensure a flow of ordinands for the Church whose personnel had been more than decimated by the Black Death. He also wished to make provision for poor boys who, like himself, had failed to get the benefits of such education.

In another chapter we are told that the church of St. Cross is not surpassed in beauty of design by the Cathedral against which it can hold its own. Then

[1] *Winchester*, by Brian Vesey-Fitzgerald. (Phoenix House Ltd., London. 1953; 18/-.)

St. Cross is a hospital, the oldest charitable institution in Great Britain and was founded by Bishop Henry de Blois, grandson of William the Conqueror. Here again we have, as the author tells us, a dominating person who was an ambitious and an evil man. It is very strange that any man should have such lofty Christian ideals and at the same time such low moral standards in his own way of life. Perhaps these irreconcilable characteristics were peculiar to Winchester bishops in the early centuries. Apparently St. Cross, which went through many vicissitudes, corruption, nepotism and neglect, called for reform on many occasions, but the hospital survived all these troubles and is still a monument to the foresight and to the better side of Henry de Blois. Shakespeare is here contradicted. 'The evil that men do lives after them, the good is oft interred with their bones'. It is not so in Winchester.

A city like Winchester, in its rich associations—with King Arthur (who, the author thinks, was a real person); with King Alfred whose magnificent statue in the Broadway expresses the vigour and grandeur of his character; with Raleigh in his later days when he was tried in the Great Hall of the Royal Palace; and with modern people like Jane Austen and Lord Wavell—a city which has been the capital of England, is well worthy the great care and affection which the author has bestowed upon it in his presentation of its story. It is pleasant to saunter round the city as described in this book with this informed, enthusiastic and genial author and savour the beauty and charm of this ancient city. It is difficult to understand why a University with a strong theological department should never have been established in this most appropriate environment.

L. FORSTER

KIERKEGAARD, THE MAN AND THE THEOLOGIAN

Some names come down in history not because their owners were great men but because of the greatness of the crisis in which they played a part.

> 'Pilate, thy name shall yet remembered be
> When those of all the Caesars are forgot.'

This seems to us to be true in the case of Sören Kierkegaard. The latest volume on Kierkegaard[1] by Prof. Jolivet, Dean of the Faculty of Philosophy in the University of Lyons, deepens this impression. Prof. Jolivet's work is a very able piece of research — thorough, sympathetic and intensely conscientious in its verdicts. The volume is divided into three parts. The first is a biographical sketch; the second, an analysis of Kierkegaard's spiritual life; and the third an estimate of Kierkegaard's contribution to the essential understanding of the Christian Religion.

We have to confess we find ourselves repelled by the personality of Sören Kierkegaard. He was an egoist through and through, an exhibitionist, a morbid religious *malade imaginaire*. His heredity, his education, his environment played a large part in the creation of his personality, but although some would describe him as a supreme literary artist and others as a religious genius, no one would dare to describe him as 'a man greatly beloved.' We doubt if he ever had a friend — man or woman — whom he did not alienate. J. H. Newman said that for himself there were only two supreme realities in the Universe: God and his own soul. The same might be said of Kierkegaard, but the Christian Religion demands more, as Kierkegaard himself recognized in a lucid interval. He wrote in his *Journal*:

> 'The love of God and the love of one's neighbour are like two doors which can be opened and shut only at the same time' (p. 230).

[1] *Introduction to Kierkegaard*, by Regis Jolivet (translated by W. H. Barber). (Muller Ltd. 15/-. 1950.)

But these two doors do not seem to have been opened at the same time in the life of Kierkegaard. Except theoretically, he was not a philanthropist. Antipathy to, not sympathy with, dominated his attitude towards his environment. Sardonic humour, not genial humanity, is his characteristic. The contemporary National Church of Denmark, with its 'low temperature of religion' and its liberal theology, became anathema to him. The Erastian ideals of Lutheranism dominated the relation of the Church to the nation. Its theology was dominated by German philosophical thought culminating in Hegelianism. The Danish bishop, Grundtvig (1783-1872), with his immense services to adult national education and literary culture, is its most perfect embodiment. Grundtvig's ideal was construction, not criticism, the development of social unity based on an inspiring national culture. It was to this that he devoted the many years of his long life. It is in Grundtvig, hardly known to-day outside Denmark, that we see the contemporary with whom Kierkegaard may justly be compared and contrasted.

Grundtvig was the devoted servant of a constructive Liberalism essentially rational and social. Kierkegaard was its opponent, an individualist and anti-rationalist, a believer in a Divine Being who made His Will known to men, not through the methods of Liberal education and social life, but by means of prophetic inspiration. Not the academic Professor and social worker but the prophetic mystic was the revealer of God.

Kierkegaard believed himself to be such a prophetic mystic. Undoubtedly such a personality has a contribution to make, but it is a contribution which has to be accepted and used with caution in national life. There are those who have wished that philosophers might be our kings: but even more dangerous to social welfare would it be if mystics were substituted for philosophers. Kierkegaard was unable to provide any practical substitutes for the contemporary institutions which he satirized.

When dying as a pauper in the public hospital in Copenhagen the visiting pastor asked Kierkegaard if he would wish to receive the sacrament. Kierkegaard replied: 'Certainly, but I can only receive it at the hands of a layman.' The pastor explained that the condition he demanded made the administration impossible. We sympathize with Kierkegaard in thus emphasizing the priesthood of the laity, but the consequence of his emphasis is typical.

Professor Jolivet in his Foreword writes:

> 'Without doubt, Kierkegaard stands out as one of the greatest among those thinkers who, without official authority, have had the noble ambition to be the apostles of Christian truth. He can be compared without hesitation to Pascal. He has the same fervour and enthusiasm, passion and harshness, power and depth, with all the dazzling gifts of genius. They are heroes of equal stature. As he himself remarked of Goethe, Kierkegaard's greatness, like Pascal's, was "to have once seen, once felt, something so incomparably great, that all else seems to be nothing beside it, something one never forgets, even if one forgets everything else" (*Journal*, 1837, I A 58). This "something," again so Pascalian, was "becoming a Christian."
>
> 'Instinctively he puts forward the most brutal formulas, summary judgements, heroic solutions. He sees truth only in the enthusiasm of passion and the ardent fervour of the partisan' (p. xii).

For Kierkegaard the act of faith by which a man becomes a Christian is 'a leap into the absurd.' If Christianity seeks the ennobling of human nature, not the effacing of it, then, says Kierkegaard, 'Christianity is culture and it is Hegel who is right.' And yet it was Tertullian to whom we owe the phrase *Credo quia absurdum*, who also wrote one of the briefest and best of

Christian Apologies in which he argued that the *anima humana* is *naturaliter Christiana*.

'In the New Testament,' as Professor Percy Gardner observed, 'Faith is not opposed to reason, but to sight.' Those who oppose Faith to Reason, as Kierkegaard does, are not doing a real servicce to the Christian Religion and the coming of the Kingdom of God on earth. On the other hand, Christian spiritual and moral experience must accompany the rational acceptance of Christian Faith.

It is for this reason that we cannot commend Kierkegaard as a Christian apologist, and we would go even further and confess that we are not certain that the religion which Kierkegaard sought to propagate is really the Christian Religion even though it be 'to the Jews a scandal and to the Greeks foolishness.' Kierkegaard's religion cannot be understood apart from his manner of life.

Kierkegaard's father wished him to become a clergyman and he qualified for ordination, but was never ordained. He dreamt of living as a clergyman in a remote rural parish, but instead he inhabited a dignified mansion in the capital. He became engaged to be married, but selfishly broke off the engagement because he felt unable to face the responsibilities and restrictions which marriage involved. He devoted himself to aesthetic gratification; later, to public criticism of ecclesiastical institutions and those who administered them. The lack of self-discipline in his earlier years having created a deep sense of frustration, was succeeded by a fanatical conversion. Kierkegaard's whole life seems to us to have been intense but unsatisfying; self-gratification followed by frustration, and that even after his conversion — a religious genius, perhaps; but not a Christian saint. H.D.A.M.

CHRISTIANITY—ITS RISE AND DEVELOPMENT

Bishop Stephen Neill's *Christian Society*[1] is a welcome and worthy addition to the Library of Constructive Theology under the general editorship of the Dean of St. Paul's. His canvas covers a wide field for he surveys the Christian Church from its primitive beginnings to its complex development at the present day.

At the outset the Bishop considers the vexed question as to whether it was the intention of Jesus to found a Church or not. While admitting that the word 'church' may never have passed His lips, he thinks that His appointment of the Twelve shows that He did found a society out of which the Church was to grow.

> 'The Christian Church of the ages cannot be understood without reference to the historic work and mission of Jesus; the historic work of Jesus cannot be rightly interpreted, unless it is seen in relation to the society which, in His own intent and purpose, was to spring from it' (p. 2).

And while admitting:

> 'That even in what are recognizable as the earliest parts of the tradition concerning Jesus, there is an element of interpretation,' the Bishop reminds us 'that we must not forget the possibility that sometimes the community was right in its interpretations, and that even when it was not recording the exact words of its Master, it had divined correctly His purpose and the direction in which it was tending.'

[1] *The Christian Society*, by Stephen Neill. (Nisbet, 1952; 17/6.)

The Christian Society was, he says,

> 'in its measure and in its place in the divine order, to be the Christ. When St. Paul spoke of the Church as the Body of Christ, so far from inventing a new concept, or adding to the Gospel something that was not already present in it, he was making explicit a basic idea which is implicit throughout. The Christian community as the Messianic society is to continue the work of the Messiah, by being what He was, and by expressing in its life as a society that which He was representatively, as the One in whom alone the true idea of Israel had been visibly wrought out' (pp. 3, 12, 19).

The story of the Church's growth amidst persecution is retold, and the author does not attempt to idealize a process which involved loss as well as gain. The threat of persecution tended to produce 'an overstrained and even hysterical mentality'; while 'in point of fact, from the beginning the Christian fellowship had been a strange amalgam of good and evil.' Nevertheless:

> 'To recognize the frailty of God's human instruments is not to deny the reality of His working, but rather, by acknowledging the manner of His working, more truly to glorify Him. If it were the case that the Church had started with a perfection never afterwards attained, its history would take the form of a most depressing paradox. If, on the other hand, God was pleased through such very human persons and through so mixed a society to carry out the miracle of the subjugation of the ancient world to the faith, there is no need for any later generation in the Church to despair. Human imperfection may hinder and delay the action of God. It is not a sign that God has deserted His Church, or that He will fail to renew it and use it for His glory' (pp. 38, 44, 45).

When we come to the period of the Reformation it is there, perhaps, that we find Bishop Neill at his best.

> 'Recent historical studies,' he says, 'have tended so to stress the economic causes and complications of the Reformation as to leave it doubtful whether there was any religious element in it at all. Such lines of interpretation can lead only to a series of intolerable and insoluble enigmas. Men did not give themselves up to be tortured and burned alive in order to transfer wealth from the dying feudal aristocracy into the hands of the rising commercial bourgeoisie. They faced martyrdom, because they believed that they had seen a new religious vision of incomparable significance, for the sake of which it was well worth a man's while to die. To do otherwise appeared in their eyes as the unpardonable sin of treachery against God. Their heirs do ill to question the rightness of their judgment, in the circumstances in which they were called to bear their witness' (p. 136).

This is excellently said; but it does not mean that the defects as well as the merits of the Reformation are not considered with frankness and realism. It is recognized that the Reformers were nowhere wholly successful, and the melancholy fact is admitted that 'in no country in the world was either the Reformation or the Counter-reformation permanently successful except through the support of the civil power. In each, great spiritual powers were developed, yet nowhere did victory or defeat depend solely on the spiritual factor' (p. 141). Indeed, 'from the lamentations of the Reformers, some have

concluded that the Reformation actually produced a decline in the level of European morals.' But this suggestion is vigorously rebutted.

> 'The best evidence for the success of the demand of the Reformation for sanctity is the moral reform achieved within the Roman Church itself. The Councils of the fifteenth century, the Renaissance, the teachings of Erasmus and the humanists, had left the Roman Curia unrepentant and a scandal to the whole of Christendom. The morals of Albert of Mainz, the Archbishop with whom Luther had most to do . . . would have disgraced a feudal nobleman in the worst days of the Dark Ages. But once the Reformation was well and truly launched, serious spirits in the Roman Church realized that, unless an immediate inner reformation were carried through, there was no bulwark that could be raised against the progress of the Protestant rebellion. Since the middle of the sixteenth century there has been no successor on the Papal throne to the vices of Alexander VI. Perhaps the Roman Cardinals have not all been saints. Never again have their vices been a public scandal to the world at large' (pp. 139-140).

Of the Reformation in England, Bishop Neill writes sympathetically of 'the virtuous Cranmer,' as he deliberately calls him. Even his sharpest critics, he says, 'do not, if they have read his writings,

> 'fail to recognize the integrity and uprightness of his personal character. And those who accuse him of timidity conveniently forget that, when Thomas Cromwell lay under sentence of death, Cranmer alone ventured to approach the king with an appeal for mercy for the man whose greatest crime was that he had been too faithful in carrying out the commands of his royal master' (p. 144).

Nor are we to allow the unpleasantness of Henry VIII and his fantastic matrimonial adventures to obscure from us the strength of his case in Canon Law. But if the King was to take upon himself the authority which the Pope had claimed hitherto (largely on the strength of the False Decretals) what was to happen if the Sovereign himself were to fall into heresy?

> 'This,' says the Bishop, 'was the agony of the closing years of Cranmer. For twenty years, he had been the protagonist in England of the idea of the supremacy of the prince as the anointed of God. But when Mary, loyally accepted as the legitimate successor of her brother, bade Cranmer burn all that he had adored and adore all that he had burned, he was placed in a dilemma from which death was the most comfortable escape. His religio-political philosophy drove him in the direction of compliance; his profound and personal adherence to the reformed doctrines made compliance impossible. In the end, religious conviction triumphed over ecclesiastical theory, and Cranmer's heroic death made its own strong contribution to the final victory of his convictions in the English Church. But if men can be driven by their theories to such intolerable moral entanglements, it is clear that there must be something wrong with the theory' (pp. 146-147).

With the expansion of the Western World went the expansion of the Christian Church. Bishop Neill gives an interesting account of the Jesuit missions to India and the Far East, followed by the rise of Protestant missionary endeavour in the eighteenth century. Here he justly observes:

> 'Anglican Evangelicals, always a minority in the Church, have not merely carried a wholly disproportionate share of Anglican missionary enterprise overseas, but, during the short period in which they were

the strongest religious force in England exercised . . . a greater Christian influence on the life of the nation than had ever previously been attained by any Christian group in so short a period of time (p. 189).

Of special interest is the account of Danish Lutheran Missions in British India which drew their support from the S.P.C.K. in London. On many occasions, we are told, the Lutheran missionaries 'served as chaplains to British soldiers and civilians, and not merely evangelicized the heathen, but baptized, married, buried, and celebrated the Holy Communion according to the Prayer Book of the Church of England. Relations between the Church of England and continental Protestantism at the time were such that this arrangement seems to have aroused no unfavourable comment in either country' (p. 199).

The closing section of the book deals with the Church at the present day, especially with the problems confronting it amid non-Christian surroundings as in India. Though its relevance to all that has preceded it is obvious, this last section does not somehow seem quite of one piece with the rest. Perhaps the interpretation of the past and analysis of the present in the light of it are best treated separately and these concluding chapters might well, had it been possible, have been expanded into another volume on their own. Moreover it has to be confessed that some of the Bishop's conclusions here are a little trite after the vigorous independence of judgment previously displayed. For example he appears to accept the commonplace but rather inadequate opinion that there was little of good to be found in the Church of England generally during the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries. Its connexion with the State at home he evidently considers to have been a handicap to its self-expression, and farther afield an unmitigated hindrance. As an example of the Church's apathy in the face of industrial expansion he cites the fact that the city of Manchester remained a single parish until after the middle of the nineteenth century, but says nothing of its having become the see of a diocesan bishop in 1848. (Incidentally *Crockford* gives some twenty parishes within the present city of Manchester which date from before 1850.) Not all will share the Bishop's optimism about the social revolution of the present day. Is it really true, as he suggests (p. 290), that comradeship and generosity are characteristic of our proletarian society—save within such narrow limits as merely constitute an extended form of selfishness? And while readers of the *Modern Churchman* certainly will not wish to see the Church made an instrument of reaction, yet the danger which Bishop Neill foresees of its becoming 'the home of those who are out of touch with the movement of the times' (p. 288) must surely depend upon how far the movement of the times is impelled by a Christian or an anti-Christian momentum. As Dean Inge observed more than forty years ago:

> 'It is not the office of the Church of Christ to be a weathercock, but to witness to the stable, eternal background in front of which these figures cross the stage, and so to preserve and maintain precisely those elements of the truth which are in most danger of being lost. For this reason, it rarely happens that the Church can "co-operate" with a popular movement; more often it is compelled to protest against its one-sidedness.' (*The Church and the Age*, p. viii.)

Happily, however, these criticism's are very limited in their reference and do not at all apply to Bishop Neill's ultimate conclusions, for in his closing pages he returns to the theme and the dimensions of his book as a whole. And his last words are certainly timely enough. He sees the problem

confronting the Church as the reconciliation of freedom and justice—a reconciliation which can only become effective when 'Christians take seriously the command to love their neighbours as themselves, and there are sufficient numbers of them to exercise a creative influence on society as a whole.'

> 'But such abstract insight into truth becomes effective only when the prophet arises who can give it content in relation to an actual situation, and can face very ordinary people with a challenge to which they must answer Yea or Nay. It does not yet appear whether in this century the prophetic vision will be given or no. It is already clear that the Christian society is entering upon one of its periods of peril. But this in itself need not cause the Christian to lose heart . . . But the Church is always in danger of falling into the sin of the builders of Shinar. To find a pleasant place and in it to build a tower of Babel seems to be an ineradicable instinct of fallen man. But the purposes of God can never be fulfilled, unless God Himself comes down to scatter the builders, and to send them forth again on their endless journey. When the Church of God is compelled to become again a pilgrim Church, then it can rejoice in the sure confidence that its redemption draweth nigh . . . To go out from the known, the secure and the familiar is always difficult. But there are sufficient pilgrims, and in particular one Pilgrim, ahead in the way to give the assurance that the experiment will not be in vain' (pp. 326-328).

Altogether this is an admirable survey of the whole vast field of Christian history and achievement, sound, scholarly and judicious. There are some mis-prints, but not many. One on p. 126 gives a touch of unconscious humour: Frederick II is described as *stupor mundi,* and his dates are given as 1194-1500—a stupendous example of longevity indeed!

D. L. Scott

A LIBERAL CATHOLIC COMMENTARY*

It is a real achievement for one scholar to write a Commentary on the whole Bible, and a further achievement to write a concise commentary. Dr. Lowther Clarke has succeeded in his plan and has thus provided a most useful book which can be confidently recommended to the many students of the Bible who want an explanation quickly of a difficult passage or who, when they wish to look up a historical fact or a critical point, are too busy to find it if it be immersed in much detail.

The work is remarkably up-to-date, and as far as we have used it, never falls into the maddening type of comment which gives a weak paraphrase of the text without conveying any information. The comment, always to the point, might perhaps sometimes be a little less concise: for example, in the introduction to *Ruth,* we miss an explanation of 'Levirate Marriage' only partly supplied by the reference in the note on i,15 to *Dt.* xxv, 5-10. But this is ungrateful, for the author tells us that to give more space to the articles he has cut down the commentaries drastically, and the articles are almost all of the kind which either set the reader thinking anew or clarify such knowledge as he has; an exception is perhaps the article on Biblical Archaeology, which is so condensed as to suggest that a bibliography under each of the headings was almost a necessity to make it really useful.

The author's catholicism shows a truly liberal attitude in his article on Sacraments in the New Testament, in the first place by including as well as

* *Concise Bible Commentary,* by the Reverend W. K. Lowther Clarke, D.D. (London. S.P.C.K. 1952: 30/-).

Baptism, Confirmation, and the Eucharist, also Ordination, Penance, Marriage, and Unction; and in the second place by his thoughful and charitable interpretation of the right application in our own day of the teaching of Jesus on marriage. Thus he writes:

> 'Jesus was dealing with the divine ideal of marriage, which he reasserted. Are we entitled to say that his words constitute a law for the Church's administration? We do not take this line with sayings like "turn the other cheek". In practice it is necessary sometimes to choose the lesser of two evils.'

Again,

> 'As we found in the case of the other Sacraments, the N.T. by itself does not provide detailed answers to our question. The principles are there, but their working out in practice has been left in God's providence to the Church.'

This is a fair indication of the good temper of this Commentary; we gratefully acknowledge Dr. Lowther Clarke's learning and the helpful way in which he has made it available.

ROBERT LEANEY

TWENTY-FIVE THOUSAND TEXTS

Many years ago a small Subject Index was included in *Helps to Study the Bible,* but nothing of the kind on a large scale appears to have been attempted hitherto. A new Concordance of the Bible[1] arranged not under key words after the manner of Cruden, but under subjects is, therefore, something new. In the present volume, so the Publishers tell us, some 25,000 texts are arranged under some 2,150 subject headings. The preacher, having once selected his theme, should now be at no loss to find texts in plenty with which to garnish and illuminate his discourse. Whether his theme be 'Aggressiveness' or 'Nations, League of'; 'Brimstone' or 'Sensationalism'; 'Blacksmith'—but not 'Coppersmith': he will find the appropriate scriptural allusions here set out for his consideration.

One hardly has the heart to criticize a book which must have involved such gigantic labours as this one, but all the same if fewer subjects had been selected and treated more comprehensively a better book would have resulted. The subject 'God,' for example, is excellently divided up into some 200 sub-headings, and 'Christ' into nearly as many. But under 'Holy Spirit' there are no sub-headings and the whole subject occupies less than a column; while the meagre four texts are all the help that is given to the preacher who finds difficulty with his sermon for Trinity Sunday and turns hopefully to the subject of 'Trinity.' These four texts include the famous gloss in I *John* v, 7 'The three heavenly witnesses'—but not the conclusion of St. Matthew (*Matthew* xxviii, 19), nor Isaiah's vision in the temple. Again, turning to 'Easter,' among the Old Testament texts to be found there, several which come readily to mind are missing, *e.g.,* 'I know that my Redeemer liveth' (*Job* xix), 'Thy dead shall live, my dead bodies shall arise' (*Isaiah* xxvi), 'After two days he will revive us, on the third day he will raise us up' (*Hosea* vi), and Ezekiel's valley of dry bones. A further search will discover this last under 'Resurrection' and the text from *Hosea* under 'Revival,' but neither of the others even there.

Nor can it be truthfully said that all the texts are by any means apposite to the subjects under which they are listed. Thus it may be strictly correct to place 'The Lord executeth righteousness and judgment' under the subject

[1] *A Concordance of Subjects,* compiled by Charles R. Joy. (A. and C. Black, 1952; 25/-.)

'Execution,' but it is a most unlikely place to find it and it is not to be found elsewhere; on the other hand the placing of 'The word was made flesh' under the heading of 'Materialism' is a really gross error. Nor does there seem much reason why 'The righteous shall flourish like the palm tree' should fall within the subject of 'Evolution.'

Another defect is the omission of all reference to the Apocrypha, especially in the case of such a subject as 'Wisdom.' This reinforces the argument that it would have been better to have made a fuller treatment of selected subjects taken from the Bible as a whole. Still with 25,000 texts arranged for twenty-five shillings one can hardly complain if the arrangement is not all that one could wish.

D. L. Scott

THE CHRISTIAN ATTITUDE TO OTHER RELIGIONS

A dispassionate study of missions and missionary problems—especially when undertaken by one who has himself spent much of his life as a missionary—must surely be something of a rarity. Such, however, is what we have in Dr. E. C. Dewick's Hulsean Lectures[1] for 1949. His theme arises out of the fact that although the present number of converts to Christianity is large, it is not by any means keeping pace with the continuing rise in the world's population, and also out of the fact that the work of the Christian missionary is being increasingly hampered by the growth of Asian and African nationalism and the spread of militant Communism.

The writer is franker than most missionaries in admitting that the moral standards of native Christians is sometimes lower than that of their pagan neighbours, even to a scandalous degree; when, for example, by undermining the authority of tribal customs the coming of Christianity has led to an increase in immorality and drunkenness. Consequently he is sceptical about the modern emphasis upon dogma instead of upon ethics—especially when this is imported into the mission field:

> 'In so far as this leads to clearer thinking and a firmer grasp on fundamental Christian principles, it is all to the good. But unless this increased emphasis on dogma is balanced by increased emphasis on—and clear and unmistakable *evidence* of—the distinctive moral supremacy of Christian life and character, it will not carry conviction with non-Christians. On the contrary, it will only increase the suspicion with which they view our Christian claims' (p. 179).

Similarly, Dr. Dewick is opposed to a rigidly hostile attitude towards non-Christian faiths, and shows not only that such an attitude is contrary to the teaching of Christ Himself, but also that a more liberal tradition has recurred continually in the Church. In this connexion, that Justin and the early Greek Fathers acknowledged that the Logos spoke through Plato as well as through Moses is generally known, but not so the story quoted here that Erasmus included in his devotions the petition: *Sancte Socrates, ora pro nobis.*

> 'It is of interest to note,' the lecturer observes, 'that while the orthodox Reformers refused to support missions to the heathen, the "liberal" Erasmus had a genuine "missionary concern"' (p. 125).

Dr. Dewick concludes that Christians may usefully co-operate with non-Christians not only in social work, but also in worship—even in non-Christian

[1] *The Christian Attitude to other Religions*, by E. C. Dewick, D.D. (Cambridge University Press, 1953; 25/-.)

worship provided this is not of a grossly unspiritual nature—and in the search for truth. For

> 'if God is One, and God is Truth, then there must be an organic unity between all elements of real truth; and to try and harmonize these is not inconsistent with Christian Faith' (p. 197).

Sometimes it may be right for a Christian believer in exceptional circumstances to remain unbaptized and within the non-Christian community to which he belongs. But this does not mean that Dr. Dewick has any doubt that the Church is altogether necessary, though he insists that the missionary aim should never be to enhance the Church's prestige but always to 'promote the reign of God and the coming of His Kingdom.' Its coming may not be realized in time, but since between time and eternity there is a vital if mysterious connexion, 'this does not mean that we can slacken our missionary efforts, or regard the Church on earth with indifference' (p. 201). For Dr. Dewick has no doubt that the Christian revelation is final 'in the sense that for us it is completely *satisfying*.' Hence, despite his advocacy of real co-operation between Christian and non-Christians, he has no sympathy with the suggestion that one religion is as good as another. True, all men are one because God is the Father of all, and all men are therefore His children. But men are also one because all alike are sinners and in consequent need of salvation. The truth which the writer perceives in Barthianism (even though 'in its extremer forms it displays the one-sidedness of heresy') is that it reminds us

> 'that if the Christian message is worth holding and proclaiming, there must be in it an element distinctive and unique. To say: "Jesus was Son of God; but so are we all!" is definitely sub-Christian; for there is really no room for calling ourselves "Christians" unless we find in Jesus Christ something *more* of God than we find anywhere else—more than in Nature, more than in history, more than in any other individual human being' (p. 155).

Altogether this is a sound and timely book, it prescribes no eccentric recipe and professes to have found no panacea undiscovered hitherto. Instead it tells us that our attitude should be shaped by the recovery of first principles as contained in the message of Jesus Christ. Thus it is marked by charity and common sense and is free from that sentimentality and vapid enthusiasm to which its subject matter lends itself so easily.

D. L. Scott

AKBAR: WARRIOR, AESTHETE, PROPHET

This book[1] is No. 7 in the series *Ethical and Religious Classics of East and West*, edited by Prof. Arberry of Cambridge, Dr. Radhakrishnan, and others. It offers a fresh and interesting study of one of the most remarkable figures in the history of religion, Akbar the Mogul Emperor, and of the school of art of which he was patron, in the age which we have in the past styled 'Elizabethan.'

Part I depicts Akbar as a seeker after Truth; a ruler who (like Asoka, nearly two millenniums earlier) turned from war to religion; a Muslim who came to appreciate the religious values of Hinduism, Zoroastrianism, and Christianity; and finally, a prophet who proclaimed the *Din Ilahi* (Divine Faith) as world-religion for all mankind. Though in this, his hopes were

[1] *Akbar's Religious Thought Reflected in Mogul Painting*, by Emmy Wellesz. (George Allen & Unwin; 12/6.)

not realized, the story of 'Akbar the Reconciler,' is still one to stir the imagination of all who seek for 'Unity in Truth.'

In Part II, we pass to Akbar as Patron of Art. The School of Painting that he founded at Fatehpur Sikri has never been surpassed, or even equalled, in its own style. It adopted features from many earlier traditions of painting; the Hindu, with its sensitiveness to detail and its rhythmic perfection (pp. 27-33); the Persian, with its balanced harmony (p. 30); the poignancy of expression from the figures in the Ajanta Caves (p. 33); and the 'background-landscapes' of mediaeval European art (p. 41).

The output of this School was prodigious. The pictures of the Legend of the Emir Hamza (a reputed uncle of the Prophet Muhammad) alone totalled some 1,400 (p. 32), and included such subjects as 'Christ in the Garden of Gethsemane' (p. 41), which might seem to have a somewhat remote connection with the main theme.

At the close of the book are forty plates, well chosen and reproduced (though not in colour), illustrating Mogul paintings of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries A.D., which help greatly to elucidate the descriptions in the text. These include not only Muslim themes, but also Hindu (Nos. 1, 32, etc.), as well as pictures of the Virgin and Child (Nos. 36, 37), and of the Jesuit Fathers debating with Muslim Divines before Akbar (No. 33).

To most readers, we think this book will bring much that is fresh and intriguing; and to the student of religion, it offers exceptionally interesting examples of the way in which art expresses religious ideals. Akbar was, in many respects, 'born before his time'; and in some ways, we have not yet attained to the ideals which he set before himself and his subjects. 'To the end of his days' (says Vincent Smith, in his *History of India*) 'he could not decipher a written word, or sign his own name; and yet he was able to take part in the discussion of literary and abstruse subjects with such skill that the listener could hardly believe him to be illiterate' (p. 367). He held strongly to the 'Liberal' ideal of toleration; but (perhaps like many other 'Liberals') he was at times far from tolerant to those who did not conform to his policy. But he was a great and generous patron of both art and religion.

E. C. Dewick

OUR NATIONAL CHURCH

Dr. F. C. Happold, the Headmaster of Bishop Wordsworth School, Salisbury, has written a popular and yet scholarly volume, *Everyone's Book about the English Church*[1] which, according to the Publishers, 'is possibly the only book of its kind.' It 'attempts to place between two covers, in a simple yet scholarly form, most of the information that ordinary people want to know about the English Church.' Certainly the present writer knows of no other book which attempts to say so much in so short a compass on such a wide range of subjects. In 140 pages of text printed in quite large type, Dr. Happold tells the story of Christianity from Pentecost to the present day, he describes the government and administration of the Church of England, the ornaments and furnishings of a church, the dress of ministers, the story of the English Bible, the history and contents of the Prayer Book, and concludes with a chapter on Hymns and Hymn tunes. It is, of course, an impossible task, and the wonder of it all is that Dr. Happold has succeeded as well as he has.

To pack so much information into so small a space and yet to produce a readable book is a remarkable achievement. In ten pages, for instance, Dr.

[1] *Everyone's Book about the English Church*, by F. C. Happold (Published by Faber & Faber Ltd. 1953; 12/6.)

Happold produces an astonishingly adequate and accurate summary of the English Prayer Book. By his acute selection of salient facts and his skilful compression he is able to expound all the important features of his story.

The author is a historian and an educationist. Both roles stand him in good stead for his book is scholarly, written with detachment, always eminently fair and unbiased in dealing with controversial questions, and at the same time his treatment is simple and lucid. Dr. Happold is in error in stating that some four hundred ministers left the Church after the *Act of Uniformity* of 1662. (Dr. Bosher in *The Making of the Restoration Settlement* quotes the figure of 936).

This book will be useful for intelligent Confirmation candidates, and for educated churchpeople who desire to be better informed about the Church of England. It is not, however, a book to persuade those who are looking for a spiritual home, it is not a book for the unbeliever in search of belief, or even for the members of other Christian churches who are feeling their way to becoming members of the Church of England and who want to be convinced of its truth and attractiveness. The book is clearly not intended for that purpose though there is one passage in which Dr. Happold writes about the essential genius of the English Church.

> 'In the presence of the eternal mysteries, the English Church has shown, at its best, an admirable humility and charity. While it has always been intent to maintain the fullness of the Christian Faith, it has refused to bind men's consciences by trying to define that faith too exactly and narrowly . . .
>
> There are some who would wish the Church to speak more definitely and precisely, to be more rigid in its discipline and dogma. Yet, if all Christians had had more of that spirit of charity and humility, which the Anglican Church has shown when truest to its genius, the history of the Christian Church might have been less tarnished by intolerance, hatred, and persecution.
>
> For a Church to have reconciled in a unique manner the principles of liberty and order, to have constantly striven for that middle way, wherein discipline does not stifle spiritual adventure nor freedom degenerate into anarchy, is something worthy of pride. And in that has lain the glory of the Church of England.'

Would there were more of this. Dr. Happold might well have enlarged on this aspect of the English church; its comprehensiveness, its belief in sound learning, and its role in the life of the nation even though he might have had less room to tell us (as he does) about maniples, amices, orphreys and the like.

W. G. Fallows

DR. T. W. MANSON'S SERVANT-MESSIAH

Professor T. W. Manson's lectures delivered finally to undergraduates at Cambridge[1] reach their climax in their treatment of the Resurrection. An exacting philologist, Dr. Manson stresses that the term resurrection connotes primarily 'awaking from sleep', recovery of consciousness: but for contemporary Jewish thought the resurrection experiences of the body was their chief concern and our Gospels reflect this.

Dr. Manson, although a valued interpreter of the Sayings of Jesus in Q, is also a firm supporter of the factual reliability of Mark's Gospel, but he does

[1] *The Servant-Messiah.* A Study of the Public Ministry of Jesus, by T. W. Manson, D.D. Cambridge University Press. 1953; 10/6.)

not believe that it originally ended at *Mk.* xvi, 8—'for they were afraid'. We agree with him.

But Dr. Manson seems to us to be unsound philologically in stressing the physical side of the women's fear (xvi, 8), *i.e.* apprehension of the danger to be encountered by returning to Galilee. Surely the women's fear was numinous. They realized that God had intervened. The Biblical use of *phobos* reflects dominantly this *Godward* aspect of fear. Dr. Manson's suggestion that the women failed to deliver the angelic message is surely contradicted by *Lk.* xxiv, 22-24 and *Mt.* xxviii, 5-9. Dr. Manson's suggestion that Paul discussed with Peter the Resurrection when they met in Jerusalem (*Gal.* i, 18, 19) is interesting but why then in I *Cor,* xv is the appearance of Jesus to James separated so widely from His appearance to Peter? We wish Dr. Manson had discussed why St. Paul omits all reference to the women's testimony to the Resurrection. Dr. Manson's lectures are well worth reading although they raise more questions than they answer convincingly, and omit to ask a number of questions that we should like him to have answered.

Prof. Manson's verdict on the historical quality of the Canonical Gospels is worth putting on record on account of the erudition and critical acumen of its author. Professor Manson writes:

> 'After every reasonable deduction has been made for human credulity, love of the marvellous, misunderstanding, propagandist zeal, dogmatic prejudices, and so on, there remains a solid and substantial body of historical material which makes an intelligible and credible story, a story which is consistent with itself and with the known conditions in the first century' (p. 54). H.D.A.M.

THE THEOLOGY OF ZWINGLI

Of the triumvirate of continental reformers Zwingli is to Englishmen less known than Luther and Calvin; indeed the Swis theologian seems generally to be noted here for his peculiar interpretation of the Eucharist. This comparative neglect is understandable, since Luther and Calvin have clearly exercised the greater influence on English religious thought and history. However, Zwingli has his own special interest, not only as a man (he alone of the three lost his life on the battlefield for his faith), but as a theologian who sought to base himself solely upon the Scriptures, yet with a humble recognition of the fallibility of his own understanding of them—'where I have not now correctly understood said Scriptures I shall allow myself to be taught better, but only from said Scriptures' (S. M. Jackson, *Selections from Zwingli,* Philadelphia, 1901, p. 111). The present work[1] of Dr. Locher is designed to rescue Zwingli's theology from what appears to be a comparable neglect on the Continent. The author believes that the quintessence of Zwingli's interpretation lies in his Christology and that its proper evaluation will provide the key to understanding the other parts of his teaching and also his actions.

The present volume, which is the first of the three in which Dr. Locher's study will be set forth, introduces Zwingli's doctrine of God through an exposition of his Christological concepts. The book is well documented, but its bibliography, with the exceptions of one Dutch and one French work, is limited to the writings of modern German-speaking theologians.

S. G. F. Brandon

[1] *Die Theologie Huldrych Zwinglis im Lichte seiner Christologie, Erster Teil: Die Gotteslehre,* by Gottfried W. Locher. (Vol. I of *Studien zur Dogmengeschichte und systematischen Theologie*), Zwingli — Verlag, Zürich, 1952, pp. 178. 11.45 Swiss francs.

THE UNFINISHED REFORMATION*

I am glad to call the attention of readers of *The Modern Churchman* to a clear, strong and wise American book under the above title. It has just been published and should be read by all who are striving on this side of the Atlantic for Unity and Truth among the Churches. Such American books should help those in Europe who are immersed in outmoded theological issues to see the general ecumenical movement in a larger and more dynamic perspective than has characterised much recent thought and effort.

It will suffice to quote Dr. Morrison's own words in nine propositions:

1. Denominationalism is exceedingly and scandalously wasteful of the resources of Protestantism.
2. It is a shameful embarrassment to the missionary expansion of Christianity.
3. It frustrates the efforts of Protestantism to discharge the responsibility which the social gospel lays upon the Christian Church.
4. It robs Protestantism of its inherent strength in its inescapable competition with a formidable and aggressive Roman Catholicism.
5. It provincializes Protestant mentality by erecting barriers against the free flow of Christian thought.
6. It breeds a subtle and corrosive moral insincerity among Protestant Christians.
7. It denies to the local church the Christian status, the breadth of outlook, the spiritual inspiration, and the richness of fellowship which is its birthright as a part of the ecumenical church.
8. It condemns the parish minister to adopt methods and appeals which appreciably stultify his ministerial self-respect as well as the Christian dignity of his high vocation.
9. Glorying in its false freedom, denominationalism denies the freedom that is in Christ.'

C. J. WRIGHT

CONCEPTIONS OF MARRIAGE IN GERMAN PIETISM†

The relationship of the sexes has constituted a problem for mankind throughout the ages and in all parts of the world. The solutions which have been attempted of this problem have, in each instance, been conditioned by the presuppositions of the *Weltanschauung* of the community or culture concerned. Accordingly, Dr. Tanner has thought it to be worth while to examine the ideas about marriage held by those people who during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries in Germany turned from the formalism of the Lutheran and Reformed Churches to a life of intense personal piety. The author finds the starting-point in each attempted solution in the Pietist concept of God and His claim upon men. The teachings of many leaders are surveyed, including (for Dr. Tanner considers Pietism in its widest bounds) Jakob Böhme, Gottfried Arnold, Count von Zinzendorf and Philipp Jakob Spener; but no solution of the age-long problem can be counted as successful, while there is much which to our minds is at the least quaint. However, the author concludes with the admonition that the problem is still with us and that our best course is to learn from the past.

S. G. F. BRANDON

* *The Unfinished Reformation*, by C. C. Morrison (former editor of *The Christian Century*). The Hoover Lectures on Christian Unity. (Harpers, New York. $3. 1953.)

† *Die Ehe im Pietismus*, by Fritz Tanner. (Zwingli-Verlag, Zürich. 1952. 242 pp. 11.95 Swiss francs.)

CORRESPONDENCE

THE MASTER OF JUSTICE

Sir,

I would like to express my great appreciation of Mr. Leslie H. Perraton's letter in your June issue under the above heading. His collation of the Dead Sea Scrolls with the *Didache* and the early chapters of the *Acts*, together with his clearly and beautifully expressed word-picture of the original Jerusalem Group of the followers of Jesus—'the Holy Servant of the Lord'—giving Him honour, reverence and leadership, but refusing to worship Him as Divine Lord and Christ (much less as *God*)—has helped me very much—a fellow layman with himself. (And, Mr. Perraton, don't let us speak of ourselves as *'mere'* laymen! We have a *very* honourable and distinguished *status!* Surely the Jerusalem Group, and Jesus Himself, were—*just laymen!*)

Mr. Perraton's letter brings into much clearer focus the problem that hitherto has been difficult, misty, and ill-defined—the problem of Jesus, versus Paul; and I wish to thank him very much for what he has written.

I would also like to respectfully thank Professor Brandon himself for having given us so freely of his scholarly research into 'Christian Origins'. Would that we in the pews could more often hear from the pulpit *a discussion, without prejudice and dogmatic bias,* of this most interesting and important matter!

MALCOLM RUTT

3 Cumberland Court,
Wallace Avenue
Worthing, Sussex.

Modern Churchmen's Conference, 1954

The 37th Annual Conference of Modern Churchmen will be held at **Westfield College, Hampstead, N.W.3,** from **Monday, September 6th to Friday, September 10th, 1954.**

Conference Theme:

CHRISTIAN LIVING IN A MODERN SOCIETY